Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-078
Tuesday
23 April 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-078 *23 April 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. 'Increased Nuclear Threat' to USSR *[TASS]* 1
U.S. Announcement of ABM System Plans Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

PRAVDA Cites EBRD's Attali on Bank's Role *[16 Apr]* 2
International Conference Views Land Reform *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Northeast Asia

Japan Visit Summarized, ROK Visit Previewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Apr]* 3
PRAVDA Reports Gorbachev Arrival in ROK *[20 Apr]* 3
No Hosts Banquet Honoring Gorbachev 4
No Tae-u Banquet Speech *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 4
Gorbachev Banquet Speech *[TASS]* 5
Paper Reports Gorbachev-No Official Talks *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 5
Trade Accord Reported *[IZVESTIYA 22 Apr]* 6
Moscow TV Reports Meeting 7
Ignatenko Briefing Reviews Summit *[Seoul TV]* 7
Commentator Views Talks *[Moscow International]* 8
Bessmertnykh, ROK's Yi To Exchange Visits *[TASS]* 9
Gorbachev Departs ROK for Home *[TASS]* 9
ROK Official, Maslyukov Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 9
Commentary Views Results of Japan Trip *[Radio Rossii]* 10

Near East & South Asia

Syrian Ba'th Official Arrives in Moscow *[Damascus Radio]* 10
Meets Dzasokhov *[TASS]* 10
Meets Primakov *[TASS]* 11
CPSU Secretary Receives Algerian Socialists *[PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 11
Delegation Meets Ivashko *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 11
Aid To Be Sent to Kurd Refugees Via Red Cross *[TASS]* 11
Rebels Step Up Kabul Shelling After Khowst Fall *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Apr]* 11
IZVESTIYA Reports Kurdish Rally in Moscow *[19 Apr]* 12
PRAVDA Views Reasons for Latest Baker Trip *[18 Apr]* 12

East Europe

PRAVDA Hosts Talks on Future of East Europe *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 13
Economic Migration to Poland Needs 'Regulation' *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* 13
Poles Check USSR Units for Chemical Weapons *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Apr]* 14

West Europe

Ignatenko Denies Gorbachev-Honecker Meeting *[Berlin ADN]* 14
Lukyanov Interviewed on Talks With Mitterrand *[PRAVDA 22 Apr]* 14
Report Reviews Pavlov's London Visit *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 15

Kvitsinskiy Defends Treaties With Germany *[NOVOYE VREMYA No 12]* 15
Problems Beset Army Property Transfer in FRG *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 18

Latin America & Caribbean

Mexican Foreign Minister in Moscow for Talks 19
Meets Bessmertnykh, Begins Talks *[TASS]* 19
Meets Gorbachev *[TASS]* 19
'Memorandum of Understanding' Signed *[TASS]* 19
Joint Communique Issued *[TASS]* 20
Resolution to U.S.-Cuba 'Mistrust' Proposed *[Moscow International]* 20
CPSU Hails Jubilee of Cuba Choosing Socialism *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 21

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Pavlov Presents Crisis Action Program 22 Apr 22
'Radical Intentions' Seen in Program *[TASS]* 22
Moscow TV on Program Debate 22
TASS Reports Deputies' Discussion 23
Nazarbayev Comments on Program *[Moscow Radio]* 24
Program Based on 'Economic Reality' *[Moscow Radio]* 24
TASS Comment on Program 25
Defense, Security Panel Chairman Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 26

Political & Social

Soyuz Deputies Hold Congress 20-21 Apr *[Moscow TV]* 29
State of Emergency Urged *[TASS]* 29
Extraordinary Congress Demanded *[Radio Rossii]* 30
Aksnis on Congress Resolution *[TASS]* 30
Perestroyka, Gorbachev Attacked *[PRAVDA 22 Apr]* 30
IZVESTIYA Account of Congress *[23 Apr]* 31
Soyuz Said Trying To Stage Coup *[Radio Rossii]* 33
Leaders Attend Lenin 121st Birthday Celebration *[TASS]* 34
Gorbachev Attends Wreath-Laying Ceremony *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Apr]* 34
Ivashko Gives Speech *[PRAVDA 23 Apr]* 34
Commentary Praises Lenin *[TASS]* 38
Oversimplification of Leninism Scored *[PRAVDA 22 Apr]* 38
Perestroyka Roundtable Held in Moscow 20-21 Apr 40
Popov, Bakatin, Ligachev Remarks *[TASS]* 40
Popov, Bakatin, Ligachev on Gorbachev *[Budapest Radio]* 40
Economic Woes, Prospects Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Shatalin, Petrakov Hit Program *[Radio Rossii]* 42
More on Shatalin, Petrakov Remarks *[TASS]* 42
Shatalin: Gorbachev Program 'Hopeless' *[Budapest Radio]* 43
Perestroyka Roundtable Ends *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Republican Interparliamentary Conference Opens *[TASS]* 44
Republican Congress Continues *[TASS]* 44
Delegates Urge 'Sovereign States' *[TASS]* 44
Conference Supports Strike Movement *[TASS]* 45
Meeting Concludes *[TASS]* 45
TASS Reviews Central Press for 23 Apr 45
Need for Gorbachev's Resignation Debated *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No. 15]* 46
Gold Miners Strike for Pay Raise *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Presidential Decree on Developing Libraries *[Moscow TV]* 48

Economic

Economists Discuss Anti-Crisis Program *[TASS]* 48
Donetsk Miners Remain on Strike 21 Apr *[Kiev Radio]* 48
Miners Strike Shows 'Signs of Abating' 22 Apr *[TASS]* 48
Some Mines Reported Back at Work 23 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 49

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Latvian-Danish Contract on Oil Prospecting *[Riga Radio]* 50
Latvian Communists Commemorate Lenin 22 Apr *[Riga Radio]* 50
Lett Group Supports Latvia's Popular Front *[TASS]* 50
Lithuania Preparing for 'Emergency Conditions' *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 50
'Moderate' Opposition Unites in Lithuania *[IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]* 50
KGB Reportedly 'Penetrating' Lithuania's Economy *[Vilnius International]* 51
Vilnius Commemorates 12 January Events *[TASS]* 51
Lithuania's Vagnorius Continues Canada Visit *[Radio Vilnius]* 51
Lithuanian Delegation Leader on Talks in Bonn *[Radio Vilnius]* 51
Lithuanian Defense Chief Visits Sweden, UK *[Radio Vilnius]* 51
Baltic Deputies Prepare for Military Talks *[TASS]* 52

RSFSR

North Ossetia Declares State of Emergency *[TASS]* 52
Ethnic Strife, Injuries Reported *[Tbilisi Radio]* 52
'Sharply Deteriorating Situation' *[TASS]* 53
Further Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to France 53
Mitterrand Aide Comments *[IZVESTIYA 19 Apr]* 53
European Parliament 'Insult' Cited *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 53
Polozkov Interviewed, Says People Want 'Order' *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 21-22 Apr]* 54
'Democratic Russia' Meeting Views 26 Apr Strike *[Radio Rossii]* 56
U.S. To Be Offered Most-Favored-Nation Status *[Radio Rossii]* 56
Dissident Bukovskiy Interviewed During Visit *[Moscow International]* 56
Attempts To Inculcate Historic 'Hatred' *[TASS]* 57
Chelyabinsk Rally Supports Striking Miners *[Moscow Radio]* 57
Police Clash With Oil Pipeline Demonstrators *[TASS]* 57
'National-Patriots' Movement Described *[TASS]* 58
Draft Law on Status of Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]* 58

Western Republics

Minsk Strike Committee Convenes Workers Rally *[TASS]* 64
20,000 Workers Demonstrate *[AFP]* 64
Belorussian Legislature Urges 'Self-Control' *[Minsk Radio]* 64
TASS Report on Internal Troops in Minsk Refuted *[IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]* 65
Belorussia Abolishes Food Sales Tax *[Minsk Radio]* 65
Ukraine Trade Union-Government Talks Discussed *[Kiev International]* 65
Hungarian Delegation Consults Ukrainians *[Budapest MTI]* 65
CPSU Activity Banned at Donetsk Pit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Apr]* 66
News Conference on Problems With Chernobyl Laws *[TASS]* 66
'Bells of Chernobyl' Media Event To Begin 25 Apr *[TASS]* 66
Program To Mark Chernobyl Anniversary in Ukraine *[Kiev Radio]* 67

Caucasus

Continuing Reportage on South Ossetia Situation 67
'Intensive Gunfire' Reported *[Tbilisi Radio]* 67
MVD Troops Help 'Extremists' *[Tbilisi Radio]* 67
MVD Troops Complicate Situation *[Tbilisi Radio]* 67
Strikes Gain Momentum in Georgia's Second City *[Tbilisi Radio]* 68
Blockade by Georgia Seen Hurting Georgia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Apr]* 68
Biography of Georgian Supreme Soviet Chairman *[TASS]* 69

Armenian Presidium on Situation, Appointments *[ARMENPRES]* 70
Armenia Ties Nuclear Power Use to Referendum *[ARMENPRES]* 70
Armenian Commission Reviews Land Privatization *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
More Attacks Reported in Nagorno-Karabakh 70
Militia Officers, Serviceman Die *[Yerevan Radio]* 70
Internal Troops Attacked *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Tension 'Not Abating' *[Yerevan International]* 71

Central Asia

Kyrgyz Supreme Soviet Rejects Union Treaty *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Apr]* 71
Kyrgyz President Presents Anti-Crisis Program *[TASS]* 71
Kyrgyz Party Work Viewed; Girenko Visits *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 72
Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan Sign Treaty *[TASS]* 72
Asian Republic Leaders To Attend Council Meeting *[AFP]* 72

U.S. 'Increased Nuclear Threat' to USSR

LD2204192291 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 22 Apr 91

[by TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The Pentagon and the Strategic Air Command have proposed to the U.S. Administration to strike from the old list of targets, to be destroyed "in any nuclear war," roughly 1,000 targets in Eastern Europe. As for the targets on Soviet territory, the Pentagon says, according to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, that the revised list should reflect only the dismantling or redeployment of Soviet military targets.

Moreover, WASHINGTON POST writes, the deletion of 1,000 targets in Eastern Europe was made "hastily" last year and "the remaining nuclear weapons were no longer efficiently assigned to remaining nuclear targets."

The new plan, according to sources in the Pentagon, "takes account of East Bloc changes more carefully and thoroughly." There are grounds to believe that, under the new plan, part of the nuclear weapons intended for the destruction of East European targets would not be destroyed, but retargetted to the Soviet Union.

WASHINGTON POST believes that "cuts (of weapons) on one side theoretically permit precisely corresponding cuts on the other side." However, the newspaper continues, "due to the adoption of slightly different approaches to fighting a nuclear war as well as uncertainties about the intentions and capabilities of the other side, strategic weapons cuts have rarely been one-for-one however."

Admittedly, it is out of place here to argue about unequal weapons cuts by the two countries. The point at issue is that the Pentagon offers an increased nuclear threat to the Soviet Union in response to the unilateral cuts in the Soviet Armed Forces and withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Eastern Europe.

U.S. Announcement of ABM System Plans Noted

PM2204154791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 First Edition p 5

["Own Information-TASS" report under the "Foreign Military News" rubric: "Washington's Plans"]

[Text] The United States is planning to develop a new satellite warning system with a view to detecting ballistic missile launches in any region of the globe, D. Atwood, first deputy defense secretary, has said. Speaking in Colorado Springs (Colorado) at a national symposium devoted to space problems, he announced that the Pentagon will begin developing individual components of the new system next year.

The system, which it is planned to deploy in space within the current decade, will make it possible, according to D. Atwood, to increase the accuracy of the information collected and provide the U.S. Armed Forces with more timely warnings. It will also make it possible to counter the threat of an intermediate-range missile attack.

PRAVDA Cites EBRD's Attali on Bank's Role

PM2204151191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[Correspondent A. Lyutyy report: "Birth: New International Bank Opened in London"]

[Excerpts] London, 15 Apr—The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), which has been much talked about in recent months, has officially been created. It was inaugurated today in the British capital at the International Maritime Organization building adorned with the flags of the founders of the new agency—40 states and the EC Commission. [passage omitted]

Jacques Attali, president of the EBRD and a former economic adviser to Francois Mitterrand, has no illusions about the colossal tasks of restructuring the economy of East Europe and the USSR. According to specialists' calculations, in the next few years this region will need investments of at least 2 trillion ecus. The new bank's potential is far more modest. But its characteristic feature is that credits will be granted for specific projects and their fulfillment will be monitored by EBRD representatives themselves. Furthermore, they will find the optimum spheres for the use of these resources. In a private conversation on the eve of the EBRD's opening I asked Attali what our economy's prime need is now.

"The Soviet Union is a vast country with a great wealth of resources," he replied. "You do not have a shortage of resources, your problem is an inability to use them effectively. The market economy should enable you to make more rational use of your resources."

"Where do you intend granting us credits?"

"For the most diverse aims but primarily the creation of a market infrastructure. I have in mind the restructuring of the financial and banking system, the formation of commercial legislation, privatization, and the training of your specialists. Credits will be granted both to the government and to local organs of power, joint ventures, and firms. For example, the EBRD could be co-owner of an enterprise and help its privatization in that way. In other words, the money will be directed where the greatest return is to be expected."

The EBRD, incidentally, does not hide the fact that the main emphasis will be placed on the return of the private sector to the countries of East Europe and the USSR and support primarily for small and medium companies, which have demonstrated their commercial flexibility and effectiveness in Western conditions.

In our conversation, Jacques Attali stressed that the EBRD is not just a financial and economic organization but also a political one, designed to facilitate the development of democratic processes in the east of the continent. That function, incidentally, is envisaged in the bank's charter. It is only in conditions of democracy, its directors believe, that the earliest transition to the market economy is possible.

The three-day conference which began here in connection with the inauguration of the EBRD is discussing the most varied practical questions, including problems of staff recruitment. Soviet specialists will be recruited to it. B. Fedorov, former Russian Government finance minister, for example, has been invited to work for the bank. Attali and his team will have to sort out a host of other technical questions, too.

International Conference Views Land Reform

PM2204125991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[A. Klimenko report: "To Protect the Peasant"]

[Text] An international scientific practical conference is being held in Moscow 15-18 April. Problems of improving agricultural legislation in the USSR and East European countries in the conditions of a regulated market are being examined. The initiators and organizers of the conference are the Moscow Juridical Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Economics of Agriculture, and the USSR Union of Lawyers.

Legal scientists from the United States, Spain, Italy, France, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia were invited to the conference. The plenary sitting opened with addresses by Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; F.P. Senko, USSR deputy prime minister; and O.Ye. Kutafin, rector of the Moscow Juridical Institute.

The speakers stressed in particular that the problem of strengthening the legal protection of rural workers in the conditions of transition to the market is extremely serious. The provision on peasant land ownership should be deemed a central one in the new land law regulations. Many questions need to be clarified. For example, the size of land parcels. Or the procedure for buying, selling, and inheriting land, the transfer of land rights to other persons in the event of losing the ability to work or reaching retirement age, and so on. These need to be precisely resolved in union republic legislation and legal acts on peasant farming, the speakers noted. Nationalization as Lenin understood it meant transferring not just land ownership into the hands of the whole of society, but also the actual land.

In carrying out the land reform, an immutable principle needs to be established to the effect that no one can be deprived of the right to ownership otherwise than on the grounds specified in the law or by the court.

The legal problems involved in improving the agro-industrial complex economic mechanism, questions of the protection of the property rights of enterprises and the constitutional rights of the Soviet peasantry, the legal aspects of the protection of the environment, and so on, will be discussed at subsequent sittings of sections of the conference.

Northeast Asia

Japan Visit Summarized, ROK Visit Previewed

PM1904210991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 91 p 5

[Report by special correspondent V. Fronin and correspondent N. Tsvetkov: "Things Are Fine With Japan; What About Korea?"]

[Text] Tokyo—The USSR president's official visit to Japan has ended. His visit to the ROK has begun.

Will anything come of the efforts made by the president, who did indeed wear himself out with his work in Tokyo? A whole range of agreements have been signed but will we get an immediate return from them? Hardly an immediate one. And was there any point in expecting one? Something else is important: The way to mutual understanding is open.

This is what Konstantin Sarkisov, a leading Soviet Japanese specialist, told us:

"It is extremely dangerous to link the resolution of political issues with economic issues. If we obtain economic aid as a result of the visit, our steps to accommodate the Japanese position could be seen as a sellout. That is why these two aspects should be kept separate. Albeit in terms of time. Stagnation [stagnatsiya] in Soviet-Japanese relations is connected not with the territorial problem, but with the Soviet economy's inability to be an adequate partner for Japan. Admittedly, departments are probably disappointed at failing to receive credits."

We turned to Tetsuo Sato, president of the Japanese-Soviet Trade Association, in order to find out our Japanese partners' opinion and heard roughly the same thing.

"The first step has been taken, and this step was also necessary in order for the Japanese Government to begin to quietly abandon the principle of 'not separating politics and the economy.' In short, the situation today is no longer what it was yesterday. You now have to prepare a base for cooperation. Say, create a modern infrastructure in the Far East."

The whole tour of the Land of the Rising Sun took less "sheer" time than was spent at the exhausting talks. It was necessary to rush on—to a meeting with President No Tae-u. On Cheju—an exotic resort island, as the travelogues say, situated 100 km from the southern shore of the Korean Peninsula, which M.S. Gorbachev has not yet visited.

The questions on the agenda for this summit meeting, the Seoul Foreign Information Service [as published] reported, include inter-Korean problems, notably inter-Korean dialogue, peace, and the reunification of the peninsula, the need for the DPRK to sign an agreement on nuclear safety at the International Atomic Energy Agency, efforts to develop ROK-Soviet cooperation, a review of security problems in Northeast Asia, and a discussion of problems of importance for the Asia-Pacific region. Bilateral relations are also being discussed at meetings between the trade and foreign ministers.

The USSR president's aircraft touched down at Cheju Airport at 2140 hours local time.

PRAVDA Reports Gorbachev Arrival in ROK

PM2204160191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Presidents' Meeting"]

[Text] Cheju, 19 Apr—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev arrived in the ROK today on a brief official visit at the invitation of President No Tae-u. As agreed, a summit meeting is taking place on Cheju Island.

In the evening an official reception was arranged at which the presidents exchanged speeches of welcome.

Following the greetings on his own behalf and on behalf of the republic's people, President No Tae-u said:

We are especially grateful that you considered it possible to make the trip despite a multitude of internal and external difficulties, particularly in internal affairs. It is our third meeting. In that brief period there have been enormous changes in the world. The Cold War has ended on the Korean peninsula and in the Asia-Pacific region. The era of reconciliation and cooperation has begun.

The friendliness and hospitality you, Mr. President, Mrs. Gorbachev, and the entire Soviet people showed during our visit to the USSR last December made a strong impression. I was particularly impressed by your political sagacity, the sagacity of the other Soviet leaders, and the Soviet people's ardent desire for reforms.

Your Excellency, your current visit to the ROK gives our people hope that the era of peace, the era of integration is coming to the Korean peninsula.

The ROK president spoke in favor of the development of the Soviet Union and eternal friendship between the two countries.

Having thanked President No Tae-u for the invitation, for the hospitality, and for the fine words about the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, the USSR president said:

The Soviet Union and the ROK are building their contacts in accordance with the criteria of the new world politics. This sets a fine example, especially as we are talking about states of the Asia-Pacific region. Some may disagree, but I am sure that there are neither objective nor subjective obstacles to the full and comprehensive development of Soviet-South Korean collaboration.

Of course, it is not enough just to make a political statement. It must always be followed by practical steps.

I want to assure you that we will do our utmost to practically exploit the favorable prerequisites that were created as a result of joint efforts over recent months. I am sure that our political dialogue will increase and be enhanced. I am sure that we will cooperate as economic and cultural equals and we will try to create the essential prerequisites for improving contacts between our people, between our peoples.

Mr. Pres. lent, I want to convey to you the opinion of our experts, which I share and support: The Soviet Union and South Korea, they believe, can create an original and effective model of collaboration by integrating their potentials in spheres where complementing one another is particularly advantageous and promising.

M.S. Gorbachev wished the Korean people happiness and prosperity and called for collaboration and good-neighborliness.

No Hosts Banquet Honoring Gorbachev

No Tae-u Banquet Speech

PM2204104391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1, 4

[Account by unidentified TASS special correspondent of speech by ROK President No Tae-u at 19 April reception on Cheju Island for USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, under general headline: "Meeting of USSR and ROK Presidents"]

[Text] We are particularly appreciative of the fact that you have deemed it possible to make this visit despite a multitude of internal and external difficulties, particularly in internal affairs. Our people have a saying: "A bad hostess delays the preparation of supper for her guests in order to whet their appetite—then they will not notice the culinary imperfections." But in our case this is not the reason why we are having supper at such a late hour. Believe me, we have striven very hard to prepare supper well and to lay the table in a fitting manner, that is, according to the significance attached to the first visit to Korea in history by a Soviet head of state and the Soviet Union's top political leader. Cheju Island is renowned as an international tourist zone. Even newlyweds frequently choose this island for their honeymoon. Japanese boys and girls are frequent guests here too.

In June last year, when we met in San Francisco, you said, Mr. President, that the ice had at last begun to break in Soviet-Korean relations too. I said in reply at the time that I hoped that we would soon be able to reap the good fruits of cooperation together. Not much time has elapsed since then: The Moscow meeting followed on just 10 months after the meeting in San Francisco, and now you and I are meeting for a third time. Tremendous changes have occurred in the world during this brief time. The "cold war" has been ended on the Korean Peninsula and in the Asia-Pacific region. An era of reconciliation and cooperation has opened.

It is now the time for all flowers to bloom vigorously on this island. Spring is in full swing. Spring not only in nature but also in our bilateral relations. I believe that the salutary warm spring winds blowing from this island will spread throughout the Korean Peninsula and through all the boundless expanses of the continent of Asia.

I am still under the strong impression of the friendliness and hospitality which you, Mr. President, Mrs. Gorbacheva, and the entire Soviet people showed us during our visit to the USSR last December. I was particularly impressed with your political perspicacity, the perspicacity of other Soviet leaders, and the Soviet people's ardent desire for reforms. I particularly recall the clear look of your young people, which I detected during my speech to a student audience at Moscow State University.

Your Excellency, this visit of yours to the ROK fills our people with hope that an epoch of peace, an era of integration is coming to the Korean Peninsula too. This visit of yours generates new stimuli to accelerate the elimination of the legacy of war—mistrust and confrontation, tension, and the threat of war—which we still feel on the Korean Peninsula. I hope that the salutary influence of your visit will help South and North Korea to advance along the path toward openness and reconciliation, by developing mutual contacts for the sake of cooperation and creating a new system of relations of coexistence and coprosperity. And this will lead, in the final analysis, to peaceful unification.

The Moscow Declaration that you and I signed laid foundations for the more accelerated development of our friendly relations and cooperation.

Your political courage and activity in perestroyka arouse a sincere sense of respect in many people throughout the world. It seems to me that, despite difficulties of various kinds, the problems which arise in the way of perestroyka will be surmounted and resolved and your plans and schemes will be implemented. The perestroyka processes are already making a weighty contribution to strengthening international peace and are ushering in a new era for the Asia-Pacific region too. I am one of those who make common cause with perestroyka. I assure you that I am always on your side and support you. If things are hard for you and if it is necessary, I am always ready to stand alongside you to give you assistance to the extent of my modest possibilities. I wish you success in perestroyka.

The ROK president expressed himself in favor of the Soviet Union's development and eternal friendship between the two countries.

Gorbachev Banquet Speech

LD1904225291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1949 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Having thanked President No Tae-u for his hospitality and for his kind words addressed to the USSR and the Soviet people, the USSR president said:

I agree with you that our present meeting clearly testifies to the acceleration of historical time. As recently as a year ago, such an event was beyond the limit of the possible, while today we are already holding our third meeting, swiftly advancing the links between our countries.

No Tae-u and I at once established mutual understanding and good relations, and I hope that tomorrow we will be able to discuss important questions and continue the dialogue started in San Francisco and developed in Moscow. Here, at the very start of the USSR president's official visit to the ROK, one must pay due tribute to the person who so energetically set about establishing relations with our country, showed active solidarity with our perestroyka, and did so moreover at a time when we especially need support. I am referring to the position, policies, and actions of the president.

Mr. President, you now recalled the joint declaration which you and I signed in Moscow. I also regard this document as one of the important ones, testifying to the profound changes taking place in world politics, in the relations between countries.

The USSR and the ROK are building their dealings on the basis of the criteria of new world politics. This is a good example, the more as we are talking about the states of the Asian-Pacific region. There may be some who think otherwise, but I am convinced that there are neither objective nor subjective obstacles for the full-blooded, all-round development of USSR-ROK interaction. Of course, such a political observation is not, in itself, sufficient. It must always be followed by practical steps. I want to assure you that we will do everything for the practical use of favorable prerequisites which were created as a result of joint efforts in the past few months. I am confident that our political dialogue will grow and be enriched. I am confident that we will cooperate as equals, both in the economy and in culture, and that we will try to create the necessary prerequisites for improving dealings between our people and our nations. What has been happening in the trade turnover between us in the past few years—it is doubling each year—shows that we can truly act precisely in this way. This is a good thing, but it is a lower stage of cooperation. We have already spoken about new forms of cooperation. It seems to me that here, perhaps, it is necessary to accelerate together. Let's set up joint enterprises, establish direct cooperation ties, draw up investment projects, and pool the efforts of scientists and managers.

Mr. President, I wish to convey the opinion of our specialists, whom I share and support: The USSR and the ROK, they consider, can create a very original and effective model of interaction, integrating their potentials in those fields were complementing each other is especially beneficial and promising.

Scholars note a great simlarity not only in what we are using in our current affairs in forging ahead and reforming society but also in what we are leaving behind. This is opening a still greater opportunity for successfully cooperation.

I hope and I am confident that that is how it will be. Tomorrow—more correctly, already today—important negotiations full of content will take place. I hope they will be successful and will pass off in a good atmosphere. In the USSR, we act on the assumption that the president's first official visit to your republics will consolidate the dynamics in the progress of our relations.

M.S. Gorbachev wished the Korean people happiness and prosperity and invited it to join in interaction and good-neighborlincss.

Paper Reports Gorbachev-No Official Talks

CM2204084391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1,4

["In-Depth Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 19 and 20 April USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and ROK president No Tae-u held their third meeting on Cheju Island (Republic of Korea), a fact which in itself indicates the dynamism and scale of bilateral relations.

The two presidents assessed the rapid development of these relations in so short a time in the context of the radical changes that are under way in the whole world and in the region where the direct interests of the two countries come together.

In a spirit of openness and trust, M.S. Gorbachev and No Tae-u compared the situations in their countries. They discovered no little similarity in the processes of the period of transition from a totalitarian system to democracy—a period which South Korea has to a large extent passed through, while the Soviet Union is grappling with its most acute peak. In such periods, President No Tae-u noted, the situation inevitably gets worse; but just as inevitably, improvement follows. The Koreans have already come to recognize this.

We, M.S. Gorbachev remarked, have already groped toward and found ways out of the state of crisis; and the main thing now is to avert an explosion, the danger of which if being fed by falling production, the collapse of the old economic links, the tendencies toward disintegration of the state, and the decline in living standards.

At the level of principles attention was paid to plans for economic cooperation, participation in which is seen by

No Tae-u as support for "the Gorbachev cause," as solidarity with the Soviet people at a difficult watershed of its history, and as South Korea's contribution to the process of beneficial international changes, the success of which is in the interests of all.

The presidents agreed that a number of projects of greatest interest to the Far East and Siberia will be elaborated at the appropriate level in the very near future. It is envisaged that third-country firms will also be invited to participate in these. Particular attention is accorded to the Sakhalin oil and gas complex on the continental shelf and to the modernisation of oil refineries in the USSR.

No Tae-u referred to bureaucratic obstacles hindering cooperation schemes already in progress or under discussion. Note was taken of this.

And in-depth exchange of opinions was held on the position in the Korean peninsula. This focused on overcoming the legacy of the "Cold War" here and on achieving the aspirations of the Korean people for the reunification of their homeland. M.S. Gorbachev confirmed that the Soviet Union, wholly sharing this aspiration, supports all constructive efforts to that end. The building-up of dialogue between the governments of South and North Korea represents an important condition on the way to unification. The USSR welcomes this. If the ROK were to play an active part in the activities of the international community and in UN initiatives and moves, this would be of mounting importance for the creation of an external atmosphere favoring that process.

There was a broad-ranging discussion at the meeting of problems and prospects facing the Asian-Pacific region and North-East Asia and of the role the two states can play and of joint action they can undertake in forming new interstate relations here and in ensuring security for both sides. The presidents exchanged views on questions concerning lowering the level of military activity in the region, reducing armaments, and averting nuclear confrontation on the peninsula. Both declared resolutely that this should not be permitted to occur.

When the one-to-one conversation was over, the talks proceeded with others present. Foreign Ministers Yi Sang-ok and A.A. Bessmertnykh, Minister of Trade and Industry Yi Pong-so, and Minister of Foreign Economic Relations K.F. Katushev reported on the work they had done over these days and on the accords reached; the presidents expressed their views on these and mapped out a procedure for further actions.

There was a common view that the Soviet-South Korean meeting on the island of Cheju was an important event transcending the bounds of bilateral relations and that it marked a new level in those relations and symbolized the start of a new stage of political dialogue and economic cooperation. In the approach to many of the questions under discussion, progress was achieved and on some of them a coincidence of positions was registered. Consultations will be continued at various levels, including at the summit level.

There was therefore a natural assent to embarking on preparing a treaty on good-neighborliness and cooperation to enshrine and develop the ideas set out in the Moscow Declaration and to form a sound juridical base for the further development of relations between the USSR and the ROK.

President No Tae-u invited the Soviet Union to take part in a new international economic forum—APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Council]—which is being set up on the initiative of South Korea and Australia, as well as in Expo-93, which is to be held in Seoul.

The USSR president confirmed his agreement to pay a state visit to the ROK at a time to be agreed later.

Trade Accord Reported

PM2204085391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by unidentified TASS special correspondent under general headline: "Accord Reached To Develop Cooperation"]

[Text] Cheju Island (ROK), 20 Apr—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and ROK President No Tae-u have reached an accord to draw up a document on the development of cooperation between the two countries and also to increase the volume of bilateral trade to the level of $10 billion a year by the midnineties.

V.N. Ignatenko, leader of the USSR president's press service, told journalists that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the ROK advocated expanding commodity turnover between the two countries to $1.5 billion this year. In 1990 the volume of bilateral trade reached $889 million, having practically tripled in two years. During the first months of this year the growth of Soviet-South Korean trade amounted to 42 percent.

Both sides voiced satisfaction with the results of the USSR president's first visit to the ROK. Yi Su-chong, the South Korean president's official spokesman, said that the top-level meeting was held "in a very warm, friendly, and cordial atmosphere."

During the talks the Soviet side advocated strengthening security in the Asia-Pacific region and emphasized its significance for maintaining peace and stability on the planet. The two countries' leaders, Yi Su-chong reported, advocated joint efforts in the interests of ending confrontation and continuing the dialogue between North and South Korea.

Moscow TV Reports Meeting

LD2004203791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Report by special correspondent V. Ilyashenko on Cheju Island; from the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Excerpt] [Ilyashenko] The picturesque island of Cheju was the location of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and No-Tae-u, president of the Republic of Korea. Until now the island has been known in northeast Asia only as a tourist center. Now it is going to enter the chronicles of international political events.

The meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President No Tae-u is taking place here in the Shilla Hotel, which has become the Soviet leader's residence. Let me remind you that this is their third meeting. When Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and No Tae-u met in San Francisco 10 months ago, it caused a genuine sensation in the world. Then, in September, diplomatic relations between our countries were established, and in December No Tae-u paid an official visit to Moscow, as a result of which a declaration about general relations between our countries and a trade and economic agreement were signed.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's working day began with a private meeting with President No Tae-u. In an open and relaxed atmosphere the leaders of the two countries discussed the extension of Soviet-South Korean cooperation and economic and trade relations, which are developing very dynamically. Attention was also focused on international problems, first and foremost the questions of ensuring security in the Asian-Pacific region and the normalization of relations between the north and the south of Korea. [Video shows two leaders meeting, in conversation around a coffee table.]

Next, Soviet-South Korean talks took place, attended by Comrades Bessmertnykh, Katushev, Kravchenko, Chernayev, and other members of the Soviet delegation. On the Korean side there were members of the No Tae-u cabinet. Here the discussion of the state and prospects for Soviet-South Korean relations in various areas was continued, in light of the declaration on the principles of relations signed in Moscow.

Your talks here, on the island, with President No Tae-u conclude your trip to northeast Asia—an official visit to Japan an talks here, with President No Tae-u. Have the hopes that you had of the official visit to Japan and the talks you held here been realized?

[Gorbachev] I hope that what we have done, and we have done a lot of work with the Government of Japan, will make it possible to advance our relations in every direction. Here, with President No Tae-u, with whom we have established good relations, although over only a few hours, we managed to discuss many things, which provided one more (?stimulus for) our relations. Here these were indeed important and interesting topics.

Bearing in mind that equally the Soviet Union, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are countries which can do a great deal in this region and that positive tendencies are developing, from this point of view this visit was useful.

[Ilyashenko] A question from Soviet television for President No Tae-u. This is already your third meeting with President Gorbachev. Have your hopes of today's talks been realized?

[No Tae-u, in Korean, fading to Russian translation] We have already held three top-level meetings between our countries. That's a fact. We discussed a wide circle of issues with President Gorbachev concerning the need to put an end to the Cold War, both on the Korean peninsula and in the region, to eliminate confrontation, to eliminate military threats, so that between the north and south of Korea seeds of peace and cooperation may be sown.

As far as economic cooperation is concerned, we have confirmed understanding of the fact that our countries [words indistinct], so to speak, mutually supplement each other. This factor of mutual supplementation is very important. That's why it has to be used fully, so that we continue to speed up the positive development of bilateral relations, give them substance, (?and make) our bilateral relations even richer. [passage omitted]

Ignatenko Briefing Reviews Summit

SK2004085891 Seoul KBS-1 Television Network in Korean 0440 GMT 20 Apr 91

[News Briefing by Vladimir Ignatenko, spokesman for the Soviet Union, on the ROK-USSR summit meeting at the Shilla Hotel press center on 20 April—live in Russian, with superimposed Korean translation]

[Text] In spite of our short stay here, 16 hours, many issues have been agreed upon and many things have been resolved.

The summit meeting has just come to an end. The summit leaders had a tete-a-tete that lasted for one and a half hours before moving to an expanded meeting.

Foreign ministers and ministers of trade and industry of the two countries held their separate meetings.

At the just-concluded expanded meeting, the two sides were able to reach an agreement.

The expanded meeting began with President No making opening remarks. He said that the Soviet-U.S. summit talks at Malta symbolized an end to the cold war, while the just-concluded Cheju summit meeting symbolizes the opening of a new era in Asia and the Pacific.

President No Tae-u said that the summit meeting can be said to mark the beginning of a new era of Asia and the Pacific.

President Gorbachev said that the just-concluded summit meeting is beyond the framework of the relations between the two countries.

Commenting on the successes attained during the just-concluded summit meeting, the Soviet president talked about a plan for signing an agreement on relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

What President Gorbachev's plan purports is to quicken the speed of developing relations between the two countries and lay a more solid legal foundation for these relations.

In response, President No Tae-u said that he, too, had thought of it for a long time and that he fully supported it. Specialists will study what name they can put to this document. Of course, this document, if and when it is realized, will elevate relations between the two countries onto a new height.

President Gorbachev proposed that the two countries jointly study the role the Soviet Union plays in the Pacific.

After explaining in detail to President No Tae-u on Soviet relations with such Asian countries as India, Australia, Singapore, and Indonesia, President Gorbachev informed him of what was discussed during his visit to Japan.

During the just-concluded summit talks, he noted the fact that countries in Asia and the Pacific produce 50 percent of the world's gross national product and that about 40 percent of the world's trade volume is being conducted by the countries in Asia and the Pacific.

The opponents expressed great concern about this plan and we could sense their great interest in this plan.

President No Tae-u mentioned the plan for International Pacific Economic Council in great detail. In this proposal President Gorbachev mentioned his ideas about arms control.

In this context, I would like to talk about the measures taken by the Soviet Union.

He mentioned the reduction of the Soviet troops deployed along the Sino-Soviet borderlines and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolia, as well as a Soviet effort to reduce nuclear forces.

Concluding their talks, the foreign ministers of the two countries made reports. According to their reports, the two countries were identical or similar on many issues.

Ministers of trade and industry said in their own reports that they had agreed to increase trade volume between the two countries to as much as $1.5 billion before the end of this year. The two countries reached an agreement on increasing the trade volume to the level of $10 billion by the mid-nineties.

"Thank you," is what I wanted to say. We have a few minutes before we leave. I have only two minutes. I will answer only one question.

[Question] [Words indistinct]

[Ignatenko] We are very satisfied with the visit. As a result of this visit, we expect relations among the countries in this region and our bilateral relations will become closer and enter a new height.

Thank you.

Commentator Views Talks

SK2004065591 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Nikolay Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] This is the first visit by a Soviet head of state to South Korea, as well as being the third meeting with the South Korean president. Relations between the two countries have rapidly improved since the meeting between President Gorbachev and President No Tae-u in San Francisco in February last year. Three months after that day, the two states established diplomatic ties and removed the obstacles which had separated the two countries for a long time.

In December last year, South Korean President visited Moscow and signed a declaration of general principles on relations between the USSR and ROK with President Gorbachev. In the document, an agreement was codified to hold periodic meetings and negotiations at various levels on the development of political dialogue based on mutual benefit, and based on current issues of bilateral relations and pending international issues.

In the short meeting to be held between the presidents of the two countries on Cheju Island, what kind of specific issues do you think will be discussed? Recently, foreign media have speculated and predicted on the subject. It is no secret that they have not all seen beneficial characteristics.

Even Pyongyang, perhaps, with their tense attitude, will wait for the outcome of the talks between USSR and South Korea. As is already known, the DPRK leadership has its own opinion on the development of relations between Moscow and Seoul. In connection with this, I would like to remind you of one general principle by which the USSR and South Korea were supposed to abide. This is the fact that the development of links and relations between Moscow and South Korea should not hurt the relations between the two countries and third countries at all. According to a Moscow dispatch from Seoul, it confirms that the mutual cooperation between the USSR and South Korea will be a factor to favorably

impact on the overall situation in the region and the situation on the Korean Peninsula.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the following remarks from the Soviet President's speech which he delivered to the Japanese Diet. President Gorbachev said: For centuries, many countries and their people have evaluated each other with the concepts "ours and theirs", and kept in mind the common rule that what helps one hurts the other. Such a philosophy, however, may be justified, our forefathers and we, ourselves, have paid dearly for it. [word indistinct], the common destiny of mankind becomes realistic. This calls for responsible politicians to take on a different scale of thinking, one that includes all mankind.

Bessmertnykh, ROK's Yi To Exchange Visits

LD2004084591 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] Cheju April 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and his South Korean counterpart Yi San-ok have agreed to exchange visits in the near future.

Gorbachev Departs ROK for Home

LD2004064991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0631 GMT 20 Apr 91

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Cheju do (Republic of Korea), 20 Apr (TASS)—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, who has been in the Republic of Korea on a short official visit at the invitation of President No Tae-u, flew home today.

ROK Official, Maslyukov Interviewed

SK2004122091 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Interview with Kim Chong-in, ROK presidential secretary for economic affairs, and Yuriy Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers, by a unidentified station correspondent in Seoul; date not given; from the "Focus on Asia" program—read by announcer]

[Text] [Announcer] As you know, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will make a brief stopover at the ROK Cheju Island on 19 April, on his way home from his visit to Japan.

President Gorbachev will meet ROK President No Tae-u there. At the ROK-Soviet summit talks, the issues concerning the ROK-Soviet cooperation in various fields, including international, regional, and economic issues, will be discussed.

Today, we will carry the contents of an interview with Kim Chong-in, the ROK presidential secretary for economic affairs, and with Yuriy Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers. This interview was held in Seoul by a station reporter. The following is the interview with Kim Chong-in:

Mr. Kim Chong-in, what do you think about economic cooperation between the two countries?

[Kim] The basic agreement on the ROK-Soviet economic cooperative relations has already been reached at the last San Francisco's summit talks of both countries. When I visited Moscow with the ROK delegation early in August 1990, I established basic principles with deputy chairman Maslyukov.

In addition, when our president visited Moscow, the heads of both countries confirmed once again the basic principles on the ROK-Soviet economic cooperation. And, I myself negotiated working-level contents related with the ROK-Soviet economic cooperation.

Because the working-level persons of both countries have prepared for various things in detail, and because the second round of the ROK-Soviet economic talks can be held due to Deputy Chairman Maslyukov's visit to Seoul, it is expected that considerable agreements will be reached in the talks.

[Announcer] The following is the interview with Yuriy Maslyukov:

Do you think that the ROK-Soviet cooperation in the fields of trade, economy, and science, and technology will play a great role in our country?

[Maslyukov] Of course, I recognize that the prospect for cooperation in the fields of radio and electronics, the development of ultramodern technology, the production of necessities, and the agricultural products processing industry is bright.

Today, at the general dialogue for deciding the direction for the ROK-Soviet economic cooperation, we should reach a detailed agreement in promoting concrete works.

In the process of the Seoul talks, we understood the success of the ROK in the fields of industry, metallurgy, electronics, shipbuilding, and car manufacturing. We are trying to learn from the ROK experiences.

[Announcer] Again we resume the interview with Presidential Economic Secretary Kim Chong-in:

Recently, items published in the Soviet Union and the ROK asserted that the trade amount between the two countries would reach $10 billion by the year 2000. What do you think about this?

[Kim] We hope that the trade amount between our two countries will reach $10 billion by 2000. If success is quickly effected in the Soviet Perestroyka policy and if the Soviet Union's economy comes to be normal, it is not difficult to reach such a trade amount, I believe.

Commentary Views Results of Japan Trip

LD2104151991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1128 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Vladimir Kulnikov commentary]

[Excerpts] The expectations for President Gorbachev's visit to Japan were great. The atmosphere around the preparations for the trip demanded them. The head of state leaves his country with its rattling internal divisions and his people sinking into poverty for a visit to a fairy-tale country of prosperity. It was clear that he would not return with empty hands, people thought. And the corresponding signals came from the circles close to the president. If we are now to summarize the concrete results of the Soviet-Japanese summit meeting, then everyone is free to make his own calculations viewing events in Tokyo from his own bell tower. Here, as the proverb has it, one says the bottle is half empty, the other insists that it is half full.

For the history of diplomacy the agreement on intentions to conclude a peace treaty is important, as are the simplifying of the procedures for traveling to the USSR for Japanese citizens and to Japan for Amur inhabitants; the agreement by the Japanese side to help perestroyka technically—it would be interesting to know what this means—and Japan's readiness to continue humanitarian aid to the victims of the Chernobyl catastrophe. By the way, it is almost five years since that tragedy. Everything is so. This is undoubtedly an achievement. But it cannot be said that they are adequate for the expectations.

The personal magic of the president did not outweigh the scales where Prime Minister Kaifu was balancing his most important decision. He remained faithful to the position worked out by all previous postwar Japanese Governments. And it is simple, coming down to the return to Japan of the Kurile islands over which the Soviet flag flies for the time being.

Once a glum USSR foreign minister, Gromyko, closing the discussion of the territorial question with Japan said that the Soviet Union has no spare islands. He said it and that was that. Now the Soviet side has shown flexibility and has agreed on the existence of the territorial problem. [passage omitted]

I think that the head of state acted carefully, not compromising with his collocutor with a radical solution of the territorial dispute. Handing over the islands, would inevitably be perceived by the world as a retreat from our position, and weakness, and would create a dangerous precedent, and could tempt other countries with territorial claims on the USSR.

But how the preparations to the talks were conducted provokes a certain objection. A second thing I want to note is the absence in our country of a genuine two-party foreign policy. As before, it is on the whole drawn up in the offices of the CPSU leaders which has particularly clearly appeared after Shevardnedze's departure. As before familiar individuals, who do not arouse particular trust, were in the delegation for all the most important talks. It is as if there have been no changes in the internal situation, as if the CPSU had not lost, particularly at the republican level, its monopoly on power. All decisions, including on the most important issues, are adopted without public or parliamentary discussion, and most importantly without taking into account the opinion of the sovereign republics, as it was during the Soviet-Japanese meetings. The consultations on the islands which at the moment belong to Russia were not detailed to the Russian leaders. During them, the center did not even show simply good-will, for example the inclusion in the delegation of Isayev, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, whose candidacy was not confirmed by the presidium. His excursion looked more like a reward for attacking Boris Nikolayevich at the recent extraordinary congress of RSFSR people's deputies. It seems to me that our foreign policy should be made a subject of constant discussion—not apologetic in the sense that the whole world follows the beginning or the end—but critical discussion during which a certain position for society is worked out on important issues.

This also happened, I recall others' experience, in Japan which remained a monolith on the northern territories issue. Two parties are needed in foreign policy in order to achieve agreement and better yet, a complete unity of positions as was the case, for example, in the United States during the solving of the Kuwaiti crisis, so important for the West. Well this is all for the future. But what is the point in extracting lessons retrospectively that then are never used?

In the meantime the president of the Soviet Union has returned from Japan to his lacerated country. He has returned from a country of rich men that could give us a lot of help. But it would not help.

Near East & South Asia

Syrian Ba'th Official Arrives in Moscow

JN1904094691 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0815 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow—Comrade 'Abdallah al-Ahmar, assistant secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party, and his delegation arrived in Moscow from Beijing last night following a visit to the PRC. Comrade al-Ahmar was received at Moscow International Airport by CPSU Central Committee officials and Comrade 'Isam al-Na'ib, ambassador of the Syrian Arab Republic in Moscow.

Meets Dzasokhov

LD2004001291 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 19 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—Member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee Alexander Dzasokhov on Friday received a delegation from the Syrian Arab Socialist Renaissance Party (ASRP) headed by the party's assistant secretary-general Abdullah al-Ahmar.

They discussed ways to develop cooperation between the two parties.

The delegation arrived in Moscow on Thursday on an official visit.

Under a plan for cooperation between the two parties in 1991-1992, signed during the meeting, the CPSU and ASRP will hold inter-party consultations on international issues, exchange delegations, foster public relations between the USSR and Syria and cooperate in training specialists and exchanging printed matter.

Dzasokhov informed the delegation about the CPSU's current activities and said the party supports the preservation of the Soviet Union as a single state and welcomes its advance to a market economy "while maintaining solid social protection of people", political stability and the establishment of constitutional order in the country.

"We will overcome all difficulties and undoubtedly remain a superpower," Dzasokhov said.

On the multiparty system in the country, Dzasokhov said "the CPSU will continue to work for the preservation of its vanguard role in society".

He voiced an opinion that despite the complexity of the situation in the country, the CPSU will remain the only organised and powerful force capable of influencing the on-going domestic processes.

Al-Ahmar said history has shown that the CPSU will overcome all difficulties and the Soviet Union will remain a single and powerful state.

The Soviet and Syrian sides expressed a mutual desire to promote ties and expand cooperation between the CPSU and ASRP.

Meets Primakov

LD2004013191 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—Member of the Soviet Security Council Yevgeniy Primakov on Friday received Abdullah al-Ahmar, assistant secretary-general of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party.

They discussed Soviet-Syrian relations and the Middle East situation.

CPSU Secretary Receives Algerian Socialists

PM1204114191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met 10 April with a delegation from the Algerian Socialist Vanguard Party [PAGS] headed by M.K. Sharif, coordinator of the PAGS Politburo, which is in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. During comradely talks there was an exchange of information on topical questions of CPSU and PAGS activity.

Delegation Meets Ivashko

PM2204092991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] V.A. Ivashko, CPSU Central Committee deputy general secretary, met with a delegation from Algeria's Socialist Vanguard Party [PAGS] headed by M.K. Sherif, PAGS Politburo coordinator, 11 April. The Algerian comrades were informed about CPSU activity aimed at overcoming the negative processes in society on the basis of the socialist choice. The PAGS delegation expressed its support for this CPSU course and described the situation in Algeria and the PAGS' work after its legalization.

During a discussion of international problems chief attention was devoted to the situation in the Near and Middle East. Questions of further developing friendly ties between both parties were also examined.

Aid To Be Sent to Kurd Refugees Via Red Cross

LD2204181291 Moscow TASS in English 1607 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—It was officially announced here today that the Soviet Peace Foundation, the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Soviet Women's Committee and the Red Cross have donated 365,000 roubles for the purchase of tents, blankets and medicine for Kurdish refugees.

The aid will be shortly sent to refugees through the channels of the International Red Cross.

Rebels Step Up Kabul Shelling After Khowst Fall

PM2204143991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

[Our special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik reports from Kabul: "'We Have Enough Ammunition'"]

[Text] While hour-long prayers devoted to the end of the Muslim religious festival of Ramadan were in progress in Afghan mosques, the residential quarters of Kabul were again subjected to rocket fire. More than 10 people, including several children, fell victim to the criminal barbaric attacks of the mujahidin. Every day more and more doleful figures reflecting losses among the civilian population are added to the tragic statistics of fratricidal war. After the fall of Khowst, the shelling of Kabul in particular has intensified.

What is the situation in the Afghan capital at present? What measures are being taken to counter the shelling? I put these questions to Lieutenant General G. Khamedi [name as transliterated], chief of staff of the Kabul Garrison.

"Since the fall of Khowst," Lieutenant General Khamedi said, "the rebels are actively getting ready to step up combat operations around Kabul. Opposition forces are massing around Shakar Darreh, Kariz-e Mir, and Kowt-e 'Ashrow at present. It is from here that massed shelling of residential quarters and the capital's airport is taking place. In order to counter this and to expand the defense zone, government troops are mounting a series of combat operations in the southwestern and southeastern direction. Aircraft are carrying out bombing raids on rebel base areas located around Lowgar. The capital's defense potential is sufficient to rebut opposition attacks from any direction. All reconnaissance components are vigilantly monitoring the situation on far and near approaches to Kabul. Our troops are firmly holding their positions here. We have enough ammunition..."

IZVESTIYA Reports Kurdish Rally in Moscow

PM1904151191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, RIA, SIBINFORM, BALT-FAX, AZIYA-PRESS, TASS, REUTER, and UPI column under general headline: "Problem of Iraqi Kurds"]

[Text] Representatives of the Iraqi Kurdistan Front are staging a three-day hunger strike in Moscow. The hunger strikers—foreign citizens and a few Soviet Kurds—have taken up position right outside the Foreign Ministry building, IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Khovratovich reports.

"We want to attract attention," the well-known Kurdish writer Bave Naze [name as transliterated] said, "above all that of Soviet official organs to the tragedy of the Kurdish people in Iraq. Yet neither the USSR parliament nor the USSR Government have hitherto taken any steps to provide even moral support for our struggle for our rights and existence. What is more, we are afraid that the Soviet Union may use its right of veto in the UN Security Council vote to create a free zone for the Kurdish refugees..."

PRAVDA Views Reasons for Latest Baker Trip

PM1904145791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 4

[Correspondent V. Gan report: "J. Baker: On the Road Again. U.S. Secretary of State's Third Trip to Near East"]

[Text] Washington—Without really having time to rest after his strenuous trip to the Near East, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker has once again set off for this region today. President G. Bush decided on this, the third trip in the last five weeks, after consultations with Baker, who returned to Washington last Friday. His route will take him through Israel, Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. The secretary of state also plans to visit Jordan to "repair" relations that have to all intents and purposes been frozen as a result of King Husayn's support for the Baghdad regime during the Gulf war.

As already announced, during his last trip the head of the U.S. foreign policy department discussed a plan for the United States, in conjunction with the Soviet Union, to organize a conference in the region that would result in the first full-scale talks between Israel, the Arab governments, and representatives of the Palestinians. At the same time he urged the conflicting sides to take "confidence-building steps" that would make it possible to lessen tension in the Near East.

People here broadly acknowledge that aside from the largely positive—verbal—reaction, Baker failed to get exhaustive answers from his interlocutors. Their avowed interest in a regional conference was not backed up with any evidence of a change in the inveterate antagonists' fundamental positions. Despite the fact that none of the Near East capitals wants to bear responsibility for wrecking the peace initiative, they all cleave to different opinions as to the procedure for holding the conference and its aims.

Israel, in particular, still rejects the "land for peace" principle, which envisages, as enshrined in UN Resolutions 242 and 338, the return of the occupied Arab territories. In turn, the Arab countries say that they will only be prepared to take part in a conference if its aims are based on these resolutions. Such questions as Palestinian representation, the location of the forum, and the role played by the Soviet Union are also unresolved.

There is no agreement on the latter. Departments in Washington say that Secretary of State Baker wants the USSR to sponsor the conference along with the United States. The indication is that this opinion is dictated by purely practical considerations. First, it constitutes realistic recognition that the Soviet Union has legitimate interests in the Near East and a repetition of U.S. attempts to "oust" it will do nothing constructive. Second, the secretary of state reckons that Soviet involvement in organizing the Near East peace process will also give the Arab states confidence that they will be protected from attacks by radical regimes that reject the

path of direct talks with Israel, which will most likely accuse them of "betraying Arab ideals."

I think that we can now talk specifically about one of two options. Either the secretary of state's trip has been brought about by the administration's concern that those involved in the Near East conflict will harden their positions, taking no steps to accommodate one another. Or, as U.S. officials claim, U.S. mediatory efforts have already borne some fruit and Baker's current round of talks "hot on the heels" of this may ensure decisive progress.

Official statements on this score are full of deliberate reservations. State Department spokesperson M. Tutwiler, for instance, said: "The President and the secretary of state are convinced that all parties are manifesting a serious approach to peace in the Near East. While we believe them to be in serious mood, there is a great deal of work to be done, many questions to be answered, and there is still a long way to go."

However, it is quite likely that this is also the most accurate description of the current state of affairs. Baker's latest trip may also clarify some matters...

East Europe

PRAVDA Hosts Talks on Future of East Europe

PM2204134791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[V. Viktorov report: "'Where East Europe Is Headed'"]

[Text] PRAVDA staffers met yesterday at the Moscow CPSU City Committee and Moscow CPSU Oblast Committee Sociopolitical Center with readers of the newspaper and anyone who wanted to take part in the discussion "Where East Europe Is Headed." Those present were curious about the most important aspects of our Western neighbors' lives. The fate of the communist and workers parties and their leaders, the Soviet troop withdrawal, economic reforms, forms of ownership, foreign debt, whether the processes occurring in East Europe can be called revolutions—that is a by no means complete list of the problems discussed.

Time did not permit all the questions to be answered. The editorial office will continue the discussion with its readers under the traditional "Dialogue" rubric.

V. Gerasimov and M. Podklyuchnikov, PRAVDA correspondents who have worked in East Europe for many years and have just returned from assignment; V. Musatov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; N. Kolikov and A. Kireyev, senior officials at that department; and journalists V. Ovchinnikov, A. Karpychev, B. Averchenko, and V. Sharov took part in the meeting.

Economic Migration to Poland Needs 'Regulation'

PM2204161191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 91 Union Edition p 6

[L. Toporkov report: "Tourists or Hired Hands? Economic Migration to Poland from the East"]

[Text] Warsaw—The phenomenon is new. Although its name, "saksy," which in Polish slang denotes people doing seasonal work abroad, is old. At one time when Poles said they were going "na saksy," it meant going to Germany to find work. The concept has subsequently broadened. Now it can be to Britain or Italy, for example, and that is still termed "saksy." Poles are energetic people and have always been willing to travel the world in search of work and pay.

Now people are going "na saksy" to Poland. These are "people from across the Bug"—Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians—for whom the West now starts beyond the Bug (for Poles it still means Germany, Italy, and France). Poland is becoming the land where you can earn extra money. Economic conditions of life are changing, the market system has broadened the scope for enterprise and has attracted people who are content to be hired for what may not be a lot but is beneficial to them.

There is a curious statistic here: In the first 2 months of this year alone 517,000 Soviet tourists visited Poland but around 40,000 did go come back. Most probably they have secretly been held back here by money—illegally earned, of course.

Polish firms and peasant farms, as Z. Janowski, chairman of the Polish construction workers' union, reported in TRYBUNA, "are ready to hire Russians because they are not too fussy, do not shun shady work, ask little for it, and do not demand any social protection at all. In addition they give a good account of themselves, they are not lazy, and they are dependable. Most often Russians are content with subsidiary work in construction, for example, work as bricklayers' assistants. The newspaper points out in particular that they do not even drink. They are marked by modesty and patience and are quite happy if the employer feeds them and pays them 400,000-500,000 zloty [Z] a month (the average wage in Poland is now around Z1.5 million a month—Toporkov note). At the bureau de change you can get approximately $40-$45 for that modest amount. As Z. Janowski points out, on the Soviet market the dollar is quoted at between 40-50 rubles [R], thus in a month you can make R1,600-R2,000 rubles. It is worth living in a shack for that.

Those are the figures. They were confirmed for me during a chance encounter in Warsaw with a "tourist from across the Bug." He asked me the best way to get to the city of Ryki, from where he had been telephoned by a friend who had previously gone there to do some building work for a prosperous farmer. I asked him how they find work and the necessary addresses. He

answered: in all parts of Poland there are unofficial "job agents" who for a certain fee provide the necessary "directions."

At the moment this new phenomenon—the "saksy from the east"—is not arousing particular alarm, according to the trade unions, which are concerned about their own unemployment, but if in time it begins to grow, as expected, there could be protest. This is a completely new phenomenon in Poland; it is being studied and forecasts are being made. It is said here that people must be ready for a massive influx of "tourists" from the East and must draw up legal norms for that eventuality. It is felt that in principle it might be no bad thing to allow people in to work in specialist spheres which are underprovided in Poland such as physicians, nurses, agricultural workers, as well as those who are willing to work at municipal cleansing enterprises. The suggestion is that by agreement with the Soviet side migration quotas should be established, vocational categories for those seeking temporary work in Poland should be defined, and the length of their contracts should be decided. The Polish Republic has such agreements with Germany. Economic migration should be built on a legal basis and, equally importantly, people should not be humiliated. Regulation is also needed to ensure that those who come here to work do not deprive Polish workers of a livelihood.

Such are the new problems that are being thrown up by life. They undoubtedly deserve attention.

Poles Check USSR Units for Chemical Weapons

PM2204145191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Bugay report: "Goodwill Gesture"]

[Text] A group of Polish Army inspectors is conducting an inspection of two Northern Group of Forces military units. The objective is to confirm the absence of chemical weapons and their components at specific military installations. Our correspondent has asked Lieutenant Colonel N. Afonin, chief of the section for ensuring the implementation of arms reduction treaties by the Northern Group of Forces:

The inspection of Soviet military installations is being carried out at the request of the Polish Government. I would like to stress that it is not a consequence of the signing of any kind of intergovernmental documents or international treaties. It is a goodwill gesture on the part of the Soviet Government extended to the Polish public. It is generally known that of late the Polish news media have published a number of articles in which the absence of chemical weapons in Northern Group of Forces units is called into question. I believe that the inspection will put an end to this campaign. During the inspection provisions and procedures on the conduct of inspections on request which were elaborated at the Geneva Disarmament Conference will be applied, and this will make it possible not only to verify the absence of chemical weapons, but also to test in practice the relevant verification provisions elaborated at multilateral talks.

West Europe

Ignatenko Denies Gorbachev-Honecker Meeting

LD2204160291 Berlin ADN in German 1537 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Vitaliy Ignatenko, spokesman for the Soviet president, today denied reports of an alleged meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Erich Honecker, former GDR head of state and Socialist Unity Party of Germany leader. He made the denial to ADN in Moscow.

The Russian Information Agency, RIA, reported last week that Gorbachev and KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov had visited Honecker a few days previously at a military hospital in Moscow. It was said that government circles in Moscow are expressing regret that the German mass media are portraying the Honecker case as a criminal case. Apparently, it was said, people are to be distracted from the fate of thousands of dissidents in the former GDR who were persecuted because of their political convictions.

Lukyanov Interviewed on Talks With Mitterrand

PM2304100791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 6

[Report on interview with USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov by correspondent V. Bolshakov, in Paris; date not given; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction: "From Common Positions"]

[Text] USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov returned to Moscow 21 April on concluding his official visit to France. Shortly before he flew out of Paris he met with our correspondent Vladimir Bolshakov, who asked him to speak about the results of the trip.

Paris—"The visit has been a very strenuous and full one," A.I. Lukyanov reported. "It began with a long conversation with French President F. Mitterrand. We spoke about the relationship between our two countries in very great detail. We also discussed such a major problem as the creation of a unified economic and legal space in Europe. All-European affairs in general occupied a significant place in that conversation. We spoke, above all, about the common European home and the all-European confederation advocated by President Mitterrand. We believe that the most important thing is to allocate the main room in such a future 'home' to all-European parliamentary establishments. This was what we talked about.

"The president asked me to brief him in detail on the situation which has taken shape in our country. And I fulfilled that request. The president was very interested

in problems connected with the upcoming conclusion of the Union Treaty and in the elaboration of an anticrisis program. It has to be said that Mitterrand showed both understanding of these problems of ours and the desire to support our country in implementing reforms.

"We agreed that President Mitterrand will come to Moscow on 6 May and have talks with the Soviet leadership."

[Bolshakov] What do we expect from this visit?

"I believe," the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman pointed out, "that it will mean not only a synchronizing of watches but also measures which will be taken to better fulfill the Treaty of Concord and Cooperation between our countries, which was ratified recently. France intends to do this in the very near future. As is known, this treaty enshrines a number of mutual obligations. As regards specific cooperation between our two countries, the treaty provides for the development of ties between the French state sector and our state enterprises and for the development of all institutions to prepare our cadres for the market economy. It also embraces a wide range of questions of technical, scientific, and cultural cooperation.

"Our legislature intends to keep all these questions under control. It has to be said that the ratification of this treaty between the USSR and France took place very successfully, although this was preceded by a detailed and, I would say, minute discussion. In the Supreme Soviet 372 deputies voted for it, 10 abstained, and only four were against it."

[Bolshakov] During your visit the French press published many articles on Soviet-French relations. It is characteristic that the concept of "bipolar" or even "multipolar" relations between Western countries and the Soviet Union is now being discussed very actively in France, as well as in the United States. It is a question of developing relations not only with the union center but also with the republics making up the USSR. Was this debate not reflected in your talks in Paris?

[Lukyanov] I discussed these problems in detail with President Mitterrand, with French National Assembly President L. Fabius, and with Foreign Minister R. Dumas. We arrived at the common conclusion that the USSR must be the chief subject in these relations. It is symbolic that the French president said that he respects the opinion and sovereignty of the republics which belong to the Union but believes that there is a single president in the Soviet Union.

Report Reviews Pavlov's London Visit

PM2204110391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 p 3

[A. Kupriyanov report: "London: Pavlov on Two Airplanes"]

[Text] The results of the visit of Soviet Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov to Great Britain are being very positively assessed here. The USSR has for the first time become an equal member of an international financial organization—the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The prime minister gave interviews to THE INDEPENDENT and the BBC, as well as to a TASS correspondent. He stressed in particular that the heads of state and government of many countries had gathered in London for the opening of the bank. "This made it possible to discuss questions in an informal situation," he stated. Indeed Valentin Sergeyevich's schedule of meetings was very busy. What were the conversations about? TASS reported on this in a short paragraph. And during a meeting in the Soviet Embassy the prime minister himself said in answer to a question about the concrete results of his trip to England that they were very good.

Personally, I was astonished at the scale of the means of transport used to convey the prime minister and his "team" to London—two airplanes—and also the number of security guards surrounding the visitors.

Kvitsinskiy Defends Treaties With Germany

91UF0649A Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 12, Mar 91 pp 18-20

[Unattributed interview with Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, deputy USSR foreign minister: "The Treaty Means More Than Money"; place and date not given]

[Text] **The unification of Germany was unavoidable. Soviet diplomacy merely acknowledged the European reality.**

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What reason is there to be confident that Germany will abide by the commitments it has assumed? Might it not happen that the Moscow Treaty will suffer the fate of the Versailles Treaty?

[Kvitsinskiy] I believe there is no reason to fear such a development. The treaty on a final settlement regarding Germany was worked out on a basis entirely different from that of the 1919 Versailles Treaty. They have little in common. I recall that the Versailles Treaty was prepared without Germany's participation, immediately following its heavy defeat in World War I. Its representatives were admitted to the Paris peace conference merely at the final curtain, so they could be presented with the text of the treaty, which had already been prepared.

Everything was fundamentally different with the Moscow Treaty. From the very outset both German states participated on an equal footing with the four powers, without any discrimination, in accordance with the "two plus four" formula, in formulating a final German settlement and a solution of questions left over from a war which ended 45 years ago. The limitations,

including military- political ones, which a united Germany assumes in accordance with the treaty, it assumes voluntarily, aware of its responsibility for peace and tranquillity in Europe. This is a guarantee that the Moscow Treaty will not subsequently be canceled out, like the Versailles Treaty.

There are also material guarantees consisting of the possibilities of dependable supervision of compliance with the commitments which Germany has assumed. Thus compliance with the commitment on the nonpossession of weapons of mass destruction will be monitored by the IAEA, the more so in that Germany confirms all its obligations in respect of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Supervision of the numbers of Germany's Armed Forces will be established with the aid of a mechanism created in accordance with the treaty on a reduction in conventional armed forces in Europe. The nondeployment of foreign forces on the territory of the former GDR may be verified by, say, the Conflict-Prevention Center. In addition, the wide-ranging inspection activity authorized currently on the territory of all of Europe prevents the exercise on a pronounced scale of any secret military activity.

The main thing, however, is that Europe today is completely different from what it was at the time of the Versailles Treaty. Massive military opposition on the continent is becoming a thing of the past. The first steps pertaining to the creation of new structures are being taken. A united Germany will occupy an appropriate place on an equal basis with the other states.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] It is sometimes heard that the Soviet Union has not obtained enough to relinquish the rights of a victorious power. How effective were these rights? How were they correlated with the existence of two sovereign German states—the GDR and the FRG?

[Kvitsinskiy] I would like to observe first that all the benefits acquired by the Soviet Union as a result of the final settlement in respect of Germany, and they are many, were obtained as the result of a difficult search for balanced decisions taking account of the interests of all participants. Each state which participated in the negotiations of the "Six" had to give up something. Relinquishing rights and responsibility is merely a part of the German settlement, although a very appreciable part, crowning it, as it were. And I would like to emphasize, furthermore, that these rights were called four-party rights, that is, they operated merely in aggregate with the rights of the other three powers, and all four victor-powers relinquished them equally, not just the Soviet Union.

In accordance with the Moscow Treaty, the Four-Power Agreement on West Berlin of 3 September 1971 becomes null and void and all corresponding institutions of the four powers are dissolved. This decision most affects the garrisons of the three Western powers in West Berlin, which were financed by the German side and which had the prerogatives of supreme authority in the city. We had long had no such prerogatives in the GDR.

Now on the question of how effective generally the rights which the USSR has relinquished were. It is not 1945. Much has changed since then. For more than 40 years two German states existed side by side on German soil. We continually pursued a policy of transferring the maximum amount of rights to the GDR Government and its legitimate authorities inasmuch as this strengthened the sovereignty of the republic and enhanced its international authority. As far, however, as the basic rights of the three powers in the FRG are concerned, they were for many years systematically transferred to a different basis by way of the three powers' conclusion of new agreements with the FRG. These agreements are fixed-term and may be denounced in accordance with the wishes of the parties.

In a word, we are talking about a qualitatively new content of these rights compared with the first postwar years. We did not consider them a fiction, but at the same time hardly anyone seriously imagined that they might actually be engaged.

Now, when the three Western powers, having ratified the treaty, have fully relinquished their rights, it would be an illusion to believe that a refusal to ratify the Moscow Treaty and other Soviet- German documents would make it possible to take advantage in some form of our former rights in respect of Germany. We would once again be left with relying solely on force, thereby, as in the "cold war" years, placing the Western powers, other European states, and Germany itself in counterposition to ourselves, with all the negative consequences for peace and security in Europe ensuing from this.

Nor should it be forgotten that for our balanced policy, based on a recognition of realities, in the process of Germany's unification we have obtained, together with decisions of the treaty on a German settlement which is of utmost importance for the security of the USSR, the gratitude of the German people, which will further bring us considerable dividends in the future.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Is there reason to believe that the FRG Government "purchased" from the USSR the right to the unification of Germany?

[Kvitsinskiy] Voices are sometimes heard in our country in connection with Germany's unification saying that we "sold" the GDR, agreed to unilateral concessions and ceded our positions. I emphatically disagree. We engaged in no haggling with Bonn in respect of the GDR. This would have been contradictory to elementary standards of morality and international law. On the contrary, the Soviet Union adhered consistently to the principle of the self-determination of nations and respect for the Germans' wish for unity. It was not we who were at the sources of the division of Germany. It was on the USSR's initiative that the decision to view Germany as a single whole was adopted at the Potsdam Conference in 1945. Even after two German states had emerged, the

Soviet Government, in conjunction with the GDR, continued for a long time (practically through the end of the 1950's) to champion the principle of the unity of Germany.

A qualitatively new situation had taken shape in Central Europe as of the fall of 1989. The sociopolitical changes which had occurred in the East European countries had objectively created the prerequisites for the process of German unification; the well-known events which occurred in the GDR in November 1989 showed that the population of the republic was advocating unification, rapid unification, what is more. This was confirmed in the result of the elections to the People's Chamber on 18 March 1990.

We were thus dealing with the people's pleasure, and this development could only have been countered with the aid of force. We could not have agreed to this for reasons of principle. Consequently, we had to think about something else—how best in the current situation to secure the interests of the Soviet Union. This is what was done.

Having concluded the treaty on a final settlement in respect of Germany and a package of Soviet-German treaties and agreements, we dependably resolved questions connected with our security, reached a new level of relations with a united Germany and acquired in it a partner ready to render us moral, political, and economic assistance in the present difficult time for us.

We were not paid a pfennig for the unification of Germany. No, strictly speaking, no one is obliged to pay for realization of his natural right to freedom of choice. The billions of marks which the USSR is receiving from the FRG are intended solely for expenditure on the support and withdrawal of Soviet forces from Germany and their fixup and provisioning on Soviet soil.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Why in the course of the negotiations was it not possible to achieve an undertaking on the withdrawal of the forces of the three Western powers from the FRG in response to the agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet forces?

[Kvitsinskiy] There are, as practice shows, no ideal solutions in politics. Something always has to be forgone, realizing that what is desired and what is actually attainable are by no means one and the same thing. What is meant by forces of the three Western powers in the FRG? Primarily 250,000 American soldiers seen in NATO not only as a material military force but also as a symbol of the inseparable connection of the security of the United States and Europe. Their departure from Germany would mean the United States' departure from Europe, which at this stage is unacceptable to the United States, to the FRG and to many other West European countries also.

In addition, it has to be considered that if the basis for the presence of the forces of the four powers was originally common and identical, namely, the occupation of a conquered fascist Germany, it had changed over time. These forces remained in the GDR and the FRG on the basis of new treaties between the two German states and the members of the military alliances to which they respectively belonged: the GDR and the USSR, and the FRG and the United States, Britain, and France. A paradoxical situation, when Soviet forces found themselves on the territory of a NATO member under conditions cardinally different from those of the three Western powers, was created with the unification of Germany, which, as is known, could not have been stopped. The difference in their position was clearly and amply outlined at the "two plus four" negotiations by the Germans themselves: it is that "the forces of the Western powers are wanted in the FRG and are being asked to stay there." No comment is necessary.

Attempts to leave our forces in the former GDR on a basis different from that on which they are there now would have led to the creation around them of an atmosphere of intolerance and would have been fraught with the danger of serious consequences. And in the financial respect the support in convertible currency of almost 400,000 soldiers would have been an insupportable burden for us.

The return of our forces from Germany is a practical contribution to the realization of our declared goal: The withdrawal of all foreign forces from foreign territory. There will be no Soviet forces in other states by 1995. The withdrawal of our forces from Germany will in itself create conditions in which Germans will be forced to wonder: Why should they, in fact, be maintaining such large-scale allied forces on their territory? Such sentiments will be nurtured also by the further progress of all-European building and the creation of new security structures. The French, Belgians, and the Dutch have already announced plans to withdraw their forces from the FRG, and the British also are intending to cut their Rhine Army in half. The question of an appreciable reduction in the American forces will also surely arise on a practical level.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] How is the question of the transportation of our forces withdrawn from Germany being tackled?

[Kvitsinskiy] DM1 billion has been allocated in accordance with the agreement with the FRG on reimbursement for this expenditure. Some complications have arisen in connection with the position of the Government of the Republic of Poland. The Polish side has raised the question of the withdrawal of our forces from Poland before the end of 1991, that is, within an utterly impracticable timeframe, and will not permit the forces withdrawn from Germany to cross its territory before this question is resolved. Negotiations are being conducted with Poland, and we hope that a sensible approach will prevail and that a mutually acceptable compromise will be found. Meanwhile, however, we have had to revise the transit routes and are now using a sea route, bypassing Poland. The timetable for the withdrawal of forces and the withdrawal of property from

Germany is being observed here, in the main. Different versions of transit will be thought up also if Poland, contrary to its own advantage, proves stubborn and continues to block our transit. We are hoping also that if the resources allocated by the FRG prove insufficient, mutual understanding may be reached with the German side on this matter.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Many articles are appearing in the Western press on negative phenomena in the Soviet forces in the FRG— instances of mass desertion, selling of weapons. If all this is happening, would it not be better to complete the troop withdrawal as quickly as possible?

[Kvitsinskiy] The question of a possible acceleration of the timeframe for the withdrawal of the Western Group of Forces is complex and has several aspects.

From the military-strategic viewpoint it is essential that we define for ourselves what role the Western Group of Forces and the Northern Group of Forces in Poland, which is closely tied to it, will perform in the new alignment of forces in Europe. Has the threat of an attack or armed intervention in our internal affairs by other states increased or diminished? Under conditions where cardinal sociopolitical changes have occurred in the East European countries are far-forward groupings of forces a plus or a minus for accomplishing the task of safeguarding the security of our state and unsusceptibility to any blackmail from outside? A competent answer to these questions was given first of all by the Defense Ministry. It is understandable, however, that much here will depend both on the leadership of our country and the USSR Supreme Soviet and on their understanding of the degree of military danger at the present time.

But even if we conclude that from the viewpoint of military strategy the deployment of Soviet forces in Germany has lost its former significance, the technical aspects of this question remain. Namely, the amount of time required for the transportation of personnel and military property, the preparation of new base areas on the territory of the USSR, the construction of housing, and the sale of the real estate belonging to the Soviet forces which is left behind on German territory.

The timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the FRG has now been drawn up with regard for all the above-mentioned factors and is scheduled for completion by the end of 1994.

As far as negative phenomena in the Western Group of Forces are concerned, they are largely of the same origin as the negative phenomena characteristic of our whole society in this transitional period. Superimposed on this additionally, of course, is the fact that our servicemen are now in a Western country with a hard currency and with all its temptations without an opportunity to avail themselves of them in full. All this requires increased attention to the Western Group of Forces, an improvement in the skilled selection of officers, warrant officers, and sergeants, and stepped-up political and educational work.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What assistance does the FRG intend to render Soviet citizens of German nationality? Will this not lead to the formation in the USSR of special zones, in which the representatives of one nationality enjoy the benefits of foreign assistance and prosper against the background of the difficult position of representatives of another nationality?

[Kvitsinskiy] Approximately 2 million citizens of German nationality live in the Soviet Union. There has recently been a sharp increase in the number of Soviet Germans leaving for the FRG for permanent residence. Almost 150,000 persons left in 1990 alone. That this number is rising constantly is cause for concern. There are many reasons why. The main thing, of course, is the general disarray of our life. But difficulties involving the development of national culture and language study are obviously playing a part also.

There have recently been certain changes in the FRG Government's policy in respect of the immigration of Soviet Germans. Whereas earlier their influx into the FRG was actively stimulated, now, when the FRG is having to deal with a mass influx from a number of East European countries, the emphasis has been put not on prompting Soviet Germans to leave but on helping create for them the appropriate conditions for self-development in the USSR.

It is a question primarily of assistance to Soviet Germans in the development of culture and language. The FRG intends to render assistance in the study of German in school and in higher and other institutions where children of Soviet Germans are studying; and in teacher training and improvement. Germany is prepared to make available teaching aids, including those presupposing the use of television, radio, audio-visual, and computer equipment.

The FRG is also studying the possibility of rendering Soviet Germans economic assistance—the construction of mobile meat-packing plants, creameries, and such in areas of Soviet Germans' compact residence. The FRG Government realizes that this assistance should be channeled not only toward Soviet Germans but also the entire population of the regions in which they live, regardless of nationality.

Problems Beset Army Property Transfer in FRG

PM2204150791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by correspondent Colonel V. Markushin: "Western Group of Forces: Is Enterprise Enough?"]

[Text] The preparations for the sale of property belonging to the Western Group of Forces are virtually complete with the creation of a special directorate in Buehnsdorf, which will tackle problems relating to the sale of property and real estate. Many questions have hitherto been agreed with the FRG Finance Ministry. Primarily the actual method of sale: on a competitive

basis, by choosing a buyer from among several contenders. A number of firms displaying an interest in buying Soviet property have also emerged.

However, I must be blunt and say that the sale of our property will not be problem-free. That is the opinion of Major General Ye. Stepanov, deputy commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces for Construction and Billeting. The point is, he says, that the German side intends to claim for damage that we have inflicted on buildings belonging to it during our use of these buildings and also for pollution. The latter applies in particular to airfields and testing ranges.

The German mass media have voiced a great deal of criticism of us in this connection. The justice of some of the criticism must, unfortunately, be acknowledged. However, journalists often provide unobjective coverage of the crux of the matter. Then Soviet garrisons and establishments come under unjust attack.

Thus, talks are under way, for instance, regarding allegedly infected effluent from the military hospital in Belitz. Yet the sewage is discharged into German purification installations, which actually bear the responsibility for treating it. In addition to the Soviet hospital, which does not, incidentally, treat contagious patients, a German tuberculosis hospital, a bakery, a laundry, and city apartment blocks also discharge their sewage here. These are not isolated occurrences.

We have not as yet received official complaints. Nevertheless the Germans intend to do so and are making careful preparations. They evidently hope to reduce to the minimum their real payments for Soviet property.

Latin America & Caribbean

Mexican Foreign Minister in Moscow for Talks

Meets Bessmertnykh, Begins Talks

LD2204085891 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and his Mexican counterpart Fernando Solana Morales, who arrived in Moscow on a working visit on Sunday, opened talks here today.

They are focusing on preparations for Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari's forthcoming visit to the USSR in the beginning of next July at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The talks will also cover key international problems, the state of bilateral relations and prospects for their development.

A memorandum is expected to be signed between the Soviet and Mexican Governments on creating a mechanism of consultations on matters of mutual interest.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valeriy Nikolayenko, Vasily Gromov, deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department of Latin American Countries, and Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin are also taking part in the negotiations.

Meets Gorbachev

LD2304100491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0922 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—Today at the Kremlin, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev received Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Relations Fernando Solana Morales, who is here on a working visit, at the latter's request.

The head of Mexico's foreign policy department conveyed greetings to the Soviet leaders from Mexico's President Carlos Salinas de Gortari and said that Mexico is watching reform processes in Soviet society closely. For his part, Mikhail Gorabchev expressed hope for a personal meeting with the Mexican president.

The conversation touched upon issues concerning the visit to the USSR by Mexican President Salinas de Gortari, which is due to take place this summer, as well as key problems of the international situation and the state of Soviet-Mexican relations.

'Memorandum of Understanding' Signed

LD2204141791 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and his Mexican counterpart Fernando Solana Morales ended talks here today after signing a memorandum of understanding between their governments to create a mechanism for consultations on issues of mutual interest.

The document, described as important by both sides, should put political consultations and meetings between statesmen from the two countries on a regular footing and lend bilateral dialogue a consistent nature.

Bessmertnykh noted the "exceptional usefulness" of the Mexican foreign minister's visit, which, he said, "will help develop relations between our countries".

Speaking in a TASS interview, he also reported the understanding that both sides will spend the next few months preparing for Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari's visit to the USSR.

"We proceed from the premise that the visit should be productive and elevate relations between the two countries to a new level," Bessmertnykh said.

He said the talks covered bilateral relations, including "a kind of stock-taking of tasks facing us and outlining treaties and agreements" to be signed during future Soviet-Mexican meetings.

Bessmertnykh pointed to "good prospects" for bilateral cooperation in economic, political and cultural fields and in efforts to deal with natural calamities and fight narcotics trafficking.

He said that the talks also dealt with wide-ranging international issues, including Latin and Central America, Europe, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf.

Integration processes in Europe and elsewhere featured prominently during the discussion, with both sides seeking to "determine their role and place in these processes", Bessmertnykh revealed.

"It is very gratifying that I was able to form a personal contact with my Mexican colleague, which we agreed to keep up more intensively, including by telephone," he said.

Joint Communique Issued

LD2304121191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1009 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS)—A Soviet-Mexican joint communique has been published here reviewing the results of the visit to the USSR by Fernando Solana Morales, Mexican secretary of foreign relations. Here follows the text of the document:

"Fernando Solana Morales, secretary of foreign relations of the United Mexican States, was in Moscow 21-23 April on a working visit as guest of the Soviet government.

"The Mexican secretary of foreign relations was received by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"During talks which were held between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Fernando Solana, Mexican secretary of foreign relations, a broad agenda was discussed covering topical international problems and issues of bilateral relations in view of the forthcoming official visit to the USSR by Carlos Salinas de Gortari, president of Mexico. The ministers expressed the common view that the determining trends of contemporary world development are the strengthening of interdependence between states, internationalization of world economic ties, growth in the prestige of the United nations as a most important instrument for the progression of positive changes and putting the whole range of international relations into a new phase of development. Examination of foreign policy problems revealed identical views on key issues of global and regional security, disarmament, settling crisis situations in the Persian Gulf zone, Central America and other parts of the world.

"There was detailed discussion of the situation in Central America. The ministers noted the significant progress which has started to emerge recently in the search for political solutions in this region. They confirmed their will to continue to support efforts aimed at a peaceful settlement in El Salvador and in Central America as a whole.

"Both sides expressed support for dynamic processes of Latin American integration, favoring broad regional cooperation and the development of mutually respectful dialogue between the Soviet Union, the countries of Eastern Europe, and states in the Rio Group.

"The ministers stressed the useful nature of continuing a regular exchange of opinions at a high level on a broad range of issues. To institutionalize Soviet-Mexican dialogue a memorandum was signed on mutual understanding between the government of the USSR and the government of the United Mexican States and on creating machinery for consultations on issues of mutual interest.

"The two sides came out in favor of expanding and raising the efficiency and mutual advantage of trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural ties. At the same time they agreed that in order to step up trade and economic relations there must be a deeper and more purposeful study of the markets and export potential of both countries. Noting the expediency of seeking new forms of cooperation such as exchanging technologies and setting up joint enterprises the ministers agreed to promote the stepping up of contacts between organizations and enterprises belonging to the two countries.

"Both sides expressed satisfaction at the fruitfull exchange of opinions which took place during the visit and which confirmed the high level which has been achieved in relations between the USSR and Mexico.

"Fernando Solana, Mexican secretary of foreign relations, conveyed an invitation to USSR foreign minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh to visit Mexico. The invitation was accepted with gratitude. The date for the visit will be agreed through diplomatic channels."

Resolution to U.S.-Cuba 'Mistrust' Proposed

PY2004030491 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Valeriy Nikolayenko, chief of the Foreign Ministry's Latin American Countries Administration, held a news conference in Havana, Cuba, in which he noted that the Soviet Union is proposing a direct dialogue between the United States and Cuba and that it is ready to contribute to bringing about this dialogue.

The Soviet diplomat characterized the mistrust between Washington and Havana as a remnant of the cold war. Valeriy Nikolayenko stressed the need to end this situation, which is not in accordance with today's climate of cooperation in the world. The main problems include the economic blockade and the threats.

According to Nikolayenko, efforts are being made to implement a series of measures to restore faith in Cuba. The Soviet Union will work to see that U.S.-Cuban relations become more predictable, based on an exchange of information on each party's intentions.

Nikolayenko said that in view of the difficulties encountered in the process of normalization of Cuban-U.S. relations in the past and in order to resolve the standoff, in his opinion the United States and Cuba must discuss all common problems directly.

According to Nikolayenko, in Soviet-U.S. talks the two have discussed the Soviet military presence in Cuba. Nikolayenko said that this cooperation is not directed against any one, that the Soviet military presence is of a defensive character, and that the Soviet Government supports a reduction of any foreign military presence in other countries. Soviet public opinion opposes the stationing of soldiers or Soviet military advisers in foreign countries, Nikolayenko added.

Nikolayenko stressed that the Soviet military mission in Cuba will end when the reasons for its presence have disappeared.

CPSU Hails Jubilee of Cuba Choosing Socialism

PM2204142591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[CPSU Central Committee Secretariat jubilee greetings message to Cuban Communist Party Central Committee; undated]

[Text] To the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee

Dear Comrades!

We cordially congratulate you on this important jubilee—the 30th anniversary of your proclaiming the socialist nature of the Cuban revolution—and we wish you the successful implementation of your plans for political and economic development.

Soviet Communists value the friendship and fruitful cooperation that has developed between our parties and peoples. The CPSU intends to continue to do its utmost to help further strengthen and develop them.

CPSU Central Committee Secretariat

Supreme Soviet

Pavlov Presents Crisis Action Program 22 Apr

'Radical Intentions' Seen in Program

LD2204130591 Moscow TASS in English 1217 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS commentator Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The anti-crisis programme presented by Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov to the Soviet parliament today demonstrates his cabinet's radical intentions, stripping opponents of almost all arguments.

Previously, the new government was accused of pursuing anti- market policies and being committed to old command methods.

The anti-crisis package provides for discontinuing non-returnable bank funding of the budget deficit, promoting commercial crediting, facilitating privatisation, and encouraging small business.

These measures formed the backbone of the "500 days" blueprint by economists Stanislav Shatalin and Grigoriy Yavlinsky, which failed to win parliamentary support.

Apart from borrowing constructive suggestions from other programmes, the cabinet's plan includes many of its own.

One very promising new idea is to divide the shares of newly- privatised enterprises between federal, republican and local authorities. This appears to be a good way to untie one of the most tangled knots in the prolonged dispute between central and republican governments on property sharing.

Unlike the authors of "500 days", who viewed privatisation as one of the principal levers of financial recovery, the cabinet sees the positive impact of privatisation as more modest.

According to government calculations, popular savings that could be used to buy factory shares do not exceed 100 billion roubles, while the overall value of basic production assets throughout the country is estimated at 2.5 trillion roubles.

Nonetheless, the cabinet thinks it possible to denationalise at least two-thirds of small enterprises in the service and consumer goods sector during 1991 and 1992.

Last week's criticism of the Cabinet plan by leading liberal economists like Yavlinskiy, Shatalin and Nikolay Petrakov was mostly political in nature and boiled down to assertions that tough measures needed to create a market can be implemented only by a government of popular trust.

The critics were positive that the unpopular Pavlov cabinet would not be able to withstand populist demands and would agree to pay increases for ever more sections of workers, provoking hyperinflation and a final crash.

This prospect may or may not be realistic, but the ability of an imaginary government of popular trust to hold out against the pressure of public discontent is just as doubtful.

The desire by opposition forces to secure the cabinet's removal at all costs prompts them to reject even such constructive government plans as the Pavlov programme out of hand.

The opposition may, of course, achieve its goal, but it will in the process lead the nation to complete collapse, leaving ruins as its legacy.

Moscow TV on Program Debate

LD2204210491

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1848 GMT on 22 April broadcasts a 90-minute "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program of recorded excerpts of the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 22 April. Reception is good. The correspondent introduces the program saying that the session debated the anti-crisis program. USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov takes the floor and presents his report on the USSR Cabinet's anticrisis program. Gorbachev and Yanayev are shown on the platform.

The announcer notes that debate of the speech followed.

Deputy Vologzhin speaks. He wants to know what is to be left under state control and what is to be privatized under the new program. He singles out the section of the program that deals with finance and credits as being particularly important. The announcer notes that the debate was continued later.

Deputy Orlov speaks from the platform noting that time has run out for lengthy debates. He calls for the anticrisis program to be passed. The right conditions for the implementation of the program should be ensured. By this he means that the Supreme Soviet should urgently pass a large number of bills. Demagogy should be rebuffed, he says. Orlov defends Pavlov saying that he is a firm figure, and criticizes the right and left for attacks on Pavlov and his governments.

Deputy Lisitskiy looks at recent events noting that coordination between the Union and the republics is not working. The price reform is under threat, Lisitskiy says, adding that the Federation Council needs to do more.

Deputy A.N.Yakovlev speaks from the platform giving a rapid summary of recent economic affairs. He is against breaking up big enterprises and is skeptical about the market's usefulness in such areas. Deputy Nosov looks

back at the history of the countryside and of the peasants. Who is going to feed the people, he asks. Nosov thinks young people must be encouraged to stay in rural areas.

Deputy Vasilets is unimpressed with the program of the democratic forces. Deputy Sukhov says the program is just another delaying tactic, another way of oppressing the working people. He does not believe the program should be adopted. He disagrees with plunging into a market system. He thinks the approach should be simpler. We should stop buying foreign luxuries and put the money saved into developing industry, Sukhov states.

Deputy Kuzmin believes that under privatization, very few people will be able to feel that they are in charge, that they own something. Deputy Khalilov says the country is out of control. He perceives that no one is complying with the Constitution or laws. He calls on Gorbachev to end this situation.

Deputy Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev speaks:

"The anticrisis program, which I support in principle, again features the words speeded-up, accelerated implementation of reforms in society, and, again, the principle of steadily implementing reforms in sequence, stage by stage. It is not conservatism but proper realism which is being sacrificed to unjustified radicalism. Everything is under our control, they are saying.

"We have been saying a lot—and there is reason to—about the need to demolish the administrative-command system once and for all. But let us be blunt. What is actually happening? In actual fact, under the pretext of abandoning command methods, the planned economy is being dismantled. Production cooperation is being destroyed. There are numerous examples of this. I would like to mention just one example. Over a period of 10-15 years the entire country created a splendid system of commercial poultry farming. The shortage of such items as eggs and poultry meat was completely eliminated. But now we once again have an extremely acute shortage of these food products.

"Just see how certain personalities are hastening to consign the precious experience of economic planning to the garbage heap of history just as fast as they can. Well, comrades, this is singular arrogance, if you do not mind my saying so. You may agree or disagree with me, but I am expressing my own clearcut view, and this is a proposal on the anticrisis program. I believe we must consider a substantial strengthening of the planning element in the country's economic and social development. The state needs both an extraordinary budget and an extraordinary plan," Ligachev concludes.

Nursultan Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, then comments on the program:

"In my view, the draft of the anti-crisis program proposed by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, on the whole, correctly defines the main areas of the transition to a market economy. An undoubted virtue of this document is also the fact that it envisages a single way out of the extremely grave state which the country is going through for all the subjects of the federation. All of us today are waiting for specific actions. Therefore, probably all of us would very much like to call for this program to be supported, all the more so since a new government has been formed and is putting forward its first program. I am inclined not to engage in criticism: may deeply esteemed Valentin Sergeyevich [Pavlov] and other members of the government regard all the remarks that I express as suggestions and a desire to improve the document.

"Certain provisions of the document directly contradict provisions, already worked out, of the new Union treaty, that is, I mean the draft, which has been published and agreed to by at least five republics, and drag us backwards to the diktat of the center and to blatant administrative injunctions. How, for example, is one to understand the introduction for 1991 of a special system for the centralized disposal of grain resources and the main types of foodstuffs of all-Union stocks? The people of Kazakhstan quite justifiably see in this an encroachment on the interests of the republic, which is the only one in the Soviet Union that dispatches grain beyond its boundaries and which supplies a significant quantity of livestock produce to all-Union stocks. If one so desires, one can find many such faults in the draft submitted for examination.

"But this is not the essential point, comrades. Constructive criticism demands specific proposals as people here have rightly stated. According to the estimates of experts, not one of the classic plans for emerging from the economic crisis can help us now. I am profoundly convinced that the implementation of the anti-crisis program and the transition to a market should, in our situation, be based on two foundations: on an economic sphere that is unified for the whole country and on the recognition of the state sovereignty of the republics. No matter how this may be attacked in this and the other hall, there is no going back on this issue. Let us agree on this. This is our principled stance, the renunciation of which will bury the hope for the coordinated and effective actions of all subjects of the Federation. But, as they say, the train has not yet departed though we have no time to spare. Kazakhstan is willing to take a most active part in reworking the program and in the subsequent implementation of anti-crisis measures," Nazarbayev concludes.

The announcer then concludes the program saying that many other people spoke but their remarks could not be included.

TASS Reports Deputies' Discussion

LD2204125691 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The Soviet parliament began to discuss the government's anti-crisis package today and almost no serious objections to the plan surfaced.

Valentin Vologzhin, chairman of the parliamentary committee on economic reform, argued for privatisation as the key factor for ending the crisis. He said it is essential to turn enterprises over to private owners partially for payment and partially for free.

Many speakers stressed the need for concerted action by the central government and the republics to achieve economic recovery.

Aleksandr Orlov, deputy chairman of the parliamentary committee on planning and budget, said that a national congress of people's deputies should be convened immediately after a new federal treaty is signed in order to amend the constitution to redefine the bounds of republican sovereignty.

He urged parliament to support the Pavlov cabinet and rebuff "political demagogues" demanding his resignation.

A number of deputies, in particular trade unionists and veterans, demanded action to prevent falling living standards and introduce income indexing.

Trade union deputy Albert Yakovlev, for instance, objected to price liberalisation under the programme, arguing that with production failing to rise, prices "will grow out of size". The debate will resume in the afternoon. According to preliminary estimates, it may continue for the whole week.

Nazarbayev Comments on Program

LD2304093891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0430 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] As we have already reported, at the fifth USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin yesterday, Prime Minister Pavlov presented the Cabinet of Ministers' action program designed to extricate the country from the crisis. The deputies have started to discuss it. The discussion will continue today. Our correspondent invited Nursultan Nazarbayev, people's deputy and president of Kazakhstan, to the microphone.

[Begin Nazarbayev recording] The economy of one individual republic alone cannot improve, given that the economies of all the republics are interlinked. The fact that a severing of ties is taking place throughout the country is affecting Kazakhstan. It is true that in our republic the decline is proceeding at a third of the pace of that in the country as a whole. But after all, deliveries are also not going to Kazakhstan. That is one factor.

As regards the program. It is simply already embarrassing for everyone to criticize every program one after the other—there is embarrassment even though this program is not a program, it is again a declaration. This must be stated outright. There is no mechanism for the specific fulfillment of what the government is proposing—we cannot see it and this I have stated specifically.

Next point. I see that I am the only one of the first leaders of the republics to attend. I did not prepare myself especially but spoke because I wanted to state my position. The fact that they are not participating also shows their attitude to the Supreme Soviet and to the government's program that we have seen. Again the republics did not take part in drawing up this program. Again the main trend is carrying out administrative-command measures. Even the provisions of the draft Union treaty which has been published are not being recognized. After all, the republics will not retreat.

I have been at the Supreme Soviet for a long time. I am simply struck by the fact that they have declared the sovereignties of the republics almost to be the inventions of some personalities there, of the leaders of these republics—rather, it is an outpouring of the will of the people.

This shows that the Supreme Soviet and individual deputies are losing touch with reality. The impression one gets is that the Supreme Soviet operates by itself and the country lives by itself. That is why these critical remarks were voiced. They are very serious and the government must draw its conclusion. Our USSR president and government must finally state their position. If we say that we are proceeding toward the market and that is our path and our direction, then one must proceed toward this market.

The program is again a kind of market program: while it says that we will change over to market relations over a period of two years, at the same time the Soviet people—that is to say the country's population—must remain in uncertainty and suffer this chaos for two more years. If one goes to market, then one must go, if there is going to be privatization then one must privatize. If there are to be free market prices, then embark on that very decisively and tell the people about it frankly, tell the people specific details: in six month's time this will happen, in a year's time that will happen, and in two years' time an improvement will set in. Of course people need to be compensated with higher wages; what else can one say here—that's clear, after all.

That is why one must finally state one's position. If one is to proceed to a market, one most proceed quickly to a market. If we are not going to do so—and Ligachev said, we must again return to the planned economy—then that must also be stated, but I am afraid that there can no longer be a return to that. [end recording]

Program Based on 'Economic Reality'

LD2204184691 Moscow All-Union First Program Radio-1 network in Russian 1456 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Valeriy Kiosa commentary]

[Text] First and foremost, I would like to note the pragmatism of this program. It is based on economic reality rather than adherence to any particular ideological choice. This extreme realism has forced the government to categorically abandon any idea of returning to the old system of administration by command which would require, at best, emergency powers and, at worst, a military dictatorship. Government representatives have repeatedly stated that they categorically reject such an option.

If I were to try to summarize this program in a few words, they would probably be long live the property owner—what is more, a property owner operating within a single economic space in this country. The creation of just such a property owner is the purpose of a whole series of measures envisaged in the government's program. Let me mention just a few of them. Privatization will be speeded up. It will begin with so-called small-scale privatization of small enterprises, shops, and consumer services. By the end of 1992, roughly two-thirds of such enterprises are to leave the public sector. The denationalization of major enterprises will continue at the same time. The accent here will be placed on the development of share-ownership.

As far as the sphere of social security is concerned, here the state intends to concentrate all its efforts on protecting the least well-off sections of the population. All the other active members of society will be expected to earn their own living rather than rely on the state. This is wholly in keeping with the rules of a market economy. However, to implement all these measures, harsh financial decisions will have to be made. The government is proposing very severe limitations on the granting of credit to executive authorities at all levels including, incidentally, the Cabinet of Ministers itself. This means that no single body of executive power will be able to spend more money than it is allowed under decisions to be agreed with the republics. After all, this credit is one of the main reasons why our economy is now running on worthless money.

What are the conditions necessary for the implementation of this program? Above all, accord. A very great deal depends on the republics at the moment. What will prevail? A wish to insist on having one's own way. If they do this, their own citizens will suffer. Given our mutually dependent economy, this will be the obvious consequence of such a course. Either that, or concern for the overall national interest will gain the upper hand. Which will be strongest—the wish to blackball the center yet again, simply because it is the center, or to at least try to understand its proposals?

There is, of course, yet another danger. This made itself apparent during today's debate in the country's Supreme Soviet on the government's program. I would describe this as the ideological danger. I mean by this the complaints that socialist choice is being violated and that our values are being destroyed. Anybody would think that we were not trying to create an efficient economy but to drive it into a predetermined set of harsh confines.

But the most dangerous prospect today is the loss of tempo, the loss of time. We have now run out of this particular commodity altogether. The economy will not last long in its present condition.

TASS Comment on Program

LD2304102991 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS news analyst Sergey Kolesnikov: "Soviet Government's Anti-Crisis Programme—TASS Comment"]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet began to discuss the long-awaited governmental programme to haul the country out of its economic crisis. The anti-crisis programme itself contains little new. The government reaffirmed yet again the Union leadership's adherence to radical market reforms. The parliament reflected the spectrum of public opinion, which, as shown in the discussion, is anti-market today.

There are no simple economic solutions to the current situation in the economy. Today, politics holds sway over the economy. In the first day of discussions about the governmental programme, several deputies took the floor and criticised the government from positions close to populism, saying that the government "has dug deep into people's pockets" and "generated poverty instead of the promised benefits".

The deputies conveyed the sentiments of the people, whose family budgets were halved by the price hikes. But how can one fulfill demands for tight financial discipline while fully compensating incomes? How can one plug the holes in the budget and maintain prices at the level typical of relatively prosperous years?

Experts at the Institute of Economic Policy predict arduous times and spiraling inflation, the development of which has been hidden for some time. Moreover, the vast and problematic oversupply of roubles, which continue to be printed and remain unmatched by food and consumer goods, recedes to insignificance when compared with the problems in oil, energy and rail transport.

The country will ensure its future only if it manages to keep key sectors of the economy in operation. If the strike movement continues, the country will face an economic catastrophe. Economists predict that even if the national economy resumes its performance from the beginning of the third quarter at last year's level, the downturn in production will still measure from 15 to 17 percent in 1991. This is almost the physical limit of the economy's ability to function.

This is why the "misunderstanding" of the government's anti-crisis measures, which is being graphically demonstrated, or the "departure" from the government's policy is so perilous today. Regrettably, this "misundrstanding" is manifest not only at the state and parliamentary levels,

but also in the latest actions by trade union organisaitons and in recent statements adopted by some Soviet Communist Party committees.

Some Western experts sometimes show a similar "misunderstanding" and not always a sincere one. Although, they should know better than anyone else the rocky road and difficulties involved in transforming one type of the economy into another.

In the current moment when the future of perestroyka is at stake, the strategic aspects of reforms should be prioritised over time-serving interests in gaining political points in a game of prejudices and preferences.

Those articulate democrats, who only recently called for the immediate resignation of the government, seem to be beginning to understand this priority. It should be clear today as never before that democratic reforms based on the transition to a market economy are incompatible with populist counter-attacks on a sensible policy that is unpopular already by virtue of its sensibility.

Economic reform is always a bitter pill. But there is no any other way to cure.

Defense, Security Panel Chairman Interviewed

PM2204140991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Leonid Vasilyevich Sharin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and Security Questions, by legislative observer Captain Second Rank V. Urban; date and place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are introduction: "'This Year Will Be a Watershed for the Army'"]

[Text] From the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA file. L.V. Sharin. Born in 1934, Russian. Education—Far East Maritime Engineering School, Khabarovsk Higher Party School. His labor career began at a military ship repairing plant. He was first secretary of the Vladivostok Gorkom [city party committee], and second secretary of the CPSU Maritime Kraykom [kray committee]. He has worked in the CPSU Central Committee.

He was elected USSR people's deputy from Amur Oblast, when he was working as first secretary of the Amur party obkom [oblast committee]. Since 1990 he has worked full-time in the USSR Supreme Soviet. He was acting chairman, and was recently elected chairman of the Committee for Defense and Security Questions.

[Urban] Leonid Vasilyevich, when military readers learn that you are the new chairman of the committee, the first thing that will probably interest them will be how familiar you are with the problems of the Army and Navy...

[Sharin] This is reasonable. So I will give a frank answer. When I was involved in party work, I had to maintain constant contact with the military and often to make joint decisions with them. This was normal practice for the leader of any large party organization.

The next thing. A year of work in the committee has also taught me a great deal. Take the visits: I had to visit both groups of forces and the fleet. So, I do have a certain experience, so to speak. And it helps to a great extent in legislative work, which is any parliament's main work. Is this answer satisfactory?

[Urban] Yes, it is quite satisfactory as a start of the conversation. But there are many questions. Perhaps this year will be a watershed for the committee. The laws the military are expecting still have not materialized. Why? What is the committee doing?

[Sharin] Indeed, there are many questions. I realize that the solution of many problems of defense and military building depends on the legislative formulation of the concept of military reform, and I would add, what form it takes. Furthermore, a law on state security organs is needed if a civilized state is to be built. Our committee is playing a leading role here, too. All these drafts are included in the work schedule of the current fifth session.

[Urban] Since the draft law on the state security organs has already been adopted at the first reading, let us start off with it.

[Sharin] The committee will submit it for examination at a second reading in the near future. Incidentally, the Supreme Soviet resolution makes it incumbent upon us to do this at the current session. Our working commission is already approaching the conclusive phase. One of the aims is to make the law as open as possible to ensure public and legislative monitoring of state security organs. For example, material for an appendix to the law is being prepared. Deputies (and indeed all Soviet people) should know the structure of the KGB and the recent changes in it. A historical reference will be appended concerning the activity of state security organs. And we also deemed it necessary to add material on laws and legal acts on whose basis U.S., FRG, Chinese, Australian, and other special services operate.

[Urban] The second main package of problems on which your committee is now working is military reform. Leonid Vasilyevich, I personally have the impression that the deputies have recently been treating this question with less urgency than before. Do you agree?

[Sharin] There are many reasons for this. Previous conversations were of a general nature. Now rough practical parliamentary work on the draft reform has started. And this is significantly more difficult than holding discussions, although these are also necessary.

But there are also objective reasons. First of all, it is not one draft that is being elaborated, but a whole package of documents connected with military reform. And now, even in comparison with last year, a great deal has changed in the situation. After all, the initial draft was in many ways based on the existence of the Warsaw Pact.

Now the bloc has fallen apart. Treaties have been concluded with many countries. This requires certain corrections in our military doctrine.

[Urban] And what do these changes involve?

[Sharin] The doctrine will remain basically defensive, but we have to bear in mind the fact that the geopolitical factor has changed. This is a reality. This means that certain positions in the draft (I think that KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers are very familiar with it) must be amplified. I know that I will receive a lot of criticism, but I have to speak about everything honestly.

Consequently, the submission to the legislature of the whole package of laws aimed at the development of military reform is being delayed somewhat. It includes the draft law on defense (it still hinges on the conclusion of the Union Treaty), the draft law on compulsory military service and the performance of military service, and the draft law on the status of servicemen. According to the plan, we should have submitted them for discussion at the beginning of April. As it is, I think this will happen in May, toward the end of the work of the fifth session, which does not change the essence of things. You noted that this year will be a watershed for the committee. In any case this year will be a watershed for the Army too. New laws will make it possible to accurately define its place in the rule-of-law state.

[Urban] We will return to this subject. And now, if you agree, let us outline the whole range of the committee's duties. Even if briefly.

[Sharin] I agree. So, I should also mention our attitude to the whole defense industry complex. I believe that any legislative organ should work for the long term, and look about 10 years ahead. What is awaiting our defense industry then? Even now it is taking more and more steps toward civilian output. I assume that defense industry sectors will soon provide the base for creating concerns where military output will no longer be the main output, as before; it will be produced on the basis of Defense Ministry orders. In addition the ministry can choose one sole contractor out of several, to whom it will offer the order. I think you know what this is about. This is the normal practice prevailing in many countries. It is now time to deceide questions of conversion and reconstruction of enterprises, and the retraining of cadres and their social protection.

[Urban] In a word, conversion...

[Sharin] Yes. And all this must be ratified by means of legislation. To be more exact, the law on conversion, on which work is continuing, should underlie any solution to the defense industry's problems.

[Urban] As far as I am aware, there are no analogous laws in the world.

[Sharin] That is the difficulty. Our approach to conversion, which was used and widely propagandized several years ago, turned out to be wrong. Conversion is only effective when this process enjoys material backup, when significant sums of money are invested in the defense industry to convert it. We sought an immediate effect, and as a result... In a word, a law on conversion is needed to avoid mistakes in the future.

[Urban] And now something about the urgent problems in the Army. Leonid Vasilyevich, what does the committee find worrying here?

[Sharin] Bear in mind that we have no intention of supplanting the Ministry of Defense or other executive structures. They are primarily responsible for the state of affairs. As I have already said, the committee is a lawmaking organ. But any legislative organ is also vested with monitoring rights.

[Urban] Is that why committee members made two trips to groups of forces and the areas of the country where our forces are returning from abroad?

[Sharin] Yes, that is the exact reason. They visited Czechoslovakia and Hungary then. Now the withdrawal from German and Polish territory has also started. So that we will also have more work. I would like to note that the committee expressed itself quite specifically while the treaties between the USSR and the FRG were being ratified. There were numerous remarks. This refers primarily to our executive power—the ministries of defense, foreign affairs, and foreign economic relations.

[Urban] What were the complaints?

[Sharin] They were connected with the fact that servicemen in East Europe lack the necessary social guarantees. This means housing, children's pre-school institutions... Over 70,000 apartments will have to be constructed for the troops being withdrawn from Germany alone, and Germany is only compensating for 36,000 apartments. The rest will be "shouldered" by the Ministry of Defense and local soviets. Everything has to be coordinated and potential and reserves have to be identified. At the moment there are many discrepancies. We will monitor the situation.

[Urban] It would be interesting to know the state of affairs as regards resolving property questions that have arisen in connection with the withdrawal of our forces.

[Sharin] We have investigated many questions. We do not intend to give away what our state has built. We found out, for example, that the solution to the bulk of property disputes has been assigned to the military for some reason. This is wrong.

[Urban] Incidentally, you have already expressed the idea that commanders of groups [of forces] should not be government plenipotentiaries in matters of the stay and withdrawal of Soviet forces.

[Sharin] This actually comes within the framework of solving the problems raised during our conversation. Yes, the committee is opposed to this. Not because we do not trust the military. It is just that someone with great

powers at state level is needed here. Our arguments were accepted by the USSR president, and this question has virtually been resolved beforehand. The commanders will start getting directly involved in the withdrawal of forces. And as for political, economic, ecological, and financial mutual relations, permanent groups of specialists formed by the government will take these on themselves.

[Urban] Servicemen's social guarantees... It is disorder in everyday matters and inadequate legal guarantees that are putting officers off service. Do you agree?

[Sharin] Undoubtedly. The new draft laws are also calculated to raise the prestige of service. Do you remember the first examination of the draft on the state security organs? The section "Cadres of the State Security Organs" is undergoing most serious changes in preparation for its second reading. What is more, our elaborations can be compared with the Law on the Soviet Militia which has already been adopted, where social guarantees have been enshrined very thoroughly. We also intend to use the same basic attitudes in the draft law on the status of servicemen.

[Urban] Since we have again broached the Supreme Soviet's examination of the draft law on state security organs, then evidently it is worth talking about other provisions in this document.

[Sharin] Go ahead.

[Urban] For example, during the discussion, the idea was expressed that it is necessary to "redistribute" KGB intelligence and counterintelligence around various state departments. That is, the state security organs should only be involved in counterintelligence work. What is your attitude to this?

[Sharin] First of all, the functions of intelligence and counterintelligence are already divided in the KGB. These are different spheres of activity. But second, intelligence and counterintelligence are interconnected. So that, in my opinion, there is no need to demolish anything here. Furthermore, that is how things developed historically in our country, which also should be borne in mind. Incidentally, many special services in the West would like to have a similar structure.

Of course I do not support the idea that schemes should never be changed once they have been set up. The functions of any government organs change with time, and new things appear. The KGB is no exception. I think that there is no point in "divorcing" intelligence and counterintelligence at the moment. Not only that, the border troops in our country also come under the KGB. And arguments about the expediency of this are also going on.

[Urban] Again certain deputies are citing foreign experience...

[Sharin] Indeed, border services are mainly autonomous abroad. All experience should be studied. But why copy things slavishly? After all, each country has its own traditions, its own approaches to state administration, its own state system finally... Yes, many superfluous functions have been laid on the KGB until recently—and in the draft law they have been mercilessly cut out. In particular, protection [okhrannyye] functions have been changed and reduced. Everything that relates to political investigation has been eliminated.

As for the border troops, here it is important to bear in mind the length of our borders. There will be no positive results if the troops are isolated, their contact with KGB territorial subunits must be direct, not through some kind of additionally created structures. I know a great deal about this from personal experience because I have almost always lived in the border area.

(Urban] Next question. Commissions or committees for defense questions have now been formed in all republic legislatures. What is your attitude to them?

[Sharin] We intend to maintain contact with them. Whoever wants to cooperate with us can do so. Suffice it to recall that during the preparation of both the first draft of the Union treaty and the current one, the committee members had successful consultations with deputies and experts from union republics. Naturally, from those republics which participated in the preparation of the draft. They supported us in our belief that the functions of defense and the determination of military policy are the right of the Union. Naturally the republics are participating in this process.

Of course, in republics whose parliaments have proclaimed secession from the USSR, the defense commissions are occupying corresponding positions. As a rule they are advocating the creation of their own armies. But in any case we are prepared to cooperate. And this is primarily in order to determine the status of our forces by means of treaties so that discriminatory acts against servicemen are repealed.

[Urban] You once said that that the committee is the largest in parliament with 44 members, but there are less than 10 working "soldiers." Has the rotation brought any changes?

[Sharin] I have not changed my opinion. Indeed, many deputies who were previously on the committee worked at local level and there were very few people permanently working in parliament. Note that this is not only our problem, but that of other committees too. Only now has everyone realized that professional parliamentarians are needed. Life is making this obligatory.

After the rotation, 19 members of our committee became members of the Supreme Soviet. Consequently they are constantly in Moscow. This means that it is possible to deploy forces where they are needed, to use a military expression.

[Urban] Another question in this connection. There were very few legal experts on the committee. And you too.

Leonid Vasilyevich, believed that this was a serious shortcoming. Have there been any changes now?

[Sharin] Yes. Big changes. Incidentally, Nikolay Alekseyevich Strukov, who has a wealth of legal experience, now heads the subcommittee for the Armed Forces.

Political & Social

Soyuz Deputies Hold Congress 20-21 Apr

LD2004231991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Here is another report from Moscow: The congress of an organization to which deputies at all levels belong—Soyuz—opened in the capital today. In the beginning of April, its leaders—Alksnis, Blokhin, and Kogan—made it clear after their meeting with the USSR president that they were in a resolute mood. One of the main demands of the deputies is the imposition of a state of emergency on the country. [Video shows woman holding a placard that says: "Put Abalkin, Aganbegyan, Arbatov, Bogomolov, Petrakov, Shatalin, G.K. Popov, and Co. on Trial for Foisting a Market on us, at the Behest of the IMF, the CIA, and the NTS, to destroy the USSR's Economy!" Video cuts to interior of hall, showing delegates and speaker at rostrum]

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Stepanyuk] This is how supporters of the Soyuz group greeted the delegates at the building on Kalinin Avenue, where the congress is taking place. Referring to the crisis situation in the country, Yuriy Blokhin, chairman of the Soyuz deputies' group in the USSR Supreme Soviet, who delivered a report, gave a detailed picture of the aims and objectives of the Soyuz organization. He believes that a state of emergency must be declared without delay throughout the country for at least six months to halt the development of negative processes. The chairman of the Soyuz group considers that it would be enough to amend and expand the existing Union treaty, rather than concluding a new one. If the present government is incapable of forestalling the looming crisis, Deputy Blokhin said in conclusion, the Soyuz parliamentary group, together with other organizations supporting this movement, are prepared to assume responsibility for the implementation, by constitutional means, of extraordinary measures.

Alarm and concern about the situation in the country were also expressed in other speeches. Delegates said that the Union should not be allowed to disintegrate, that its unity and territorial integrity should be preserved, and that equal rights should be guaranteed to all citizens irrespective of nationality, creed, or political persuasion. [Video shows two additional speakers, then a shot of the Presidium, which includes Lieutenant Colonel Petrushenko, another Soyuz leader, who is wearing a military uniform, unlike Alksnis]

One of the leaders of the Soyuz group, Deputy Alksnis, declared that the perestroyka policy adopted in 1985 is collapsing. He urged the deputies to start collecting signatures for convening an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies, at which a motion calling for a state of emergency would be tabled.

The congress will continue tomorrow. On the agenda is the endorsement of the rules and program of the all-union voluntary association of people's deputies and voters, Soyuz. [end recording]

State of Emergency Urged

LD2304074191 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS commentator Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—The influential Soyuz (Union) faction in the Soviet parliament has said publicly for the first time that it wants a state of emergency declared throughout the country.

Its leader Yuriy Blokhin announced at the caucus's two-day convention, which ended on Sunday, that should President Mikhail Gorbachev refuse to place the country on an emergency footing, Soyuz would be "prepared to assume full responsibility for introducing emergency measures".

But can it really pull it off?

The emergency package, according to Blokhin, should include action to curb republican separatism, suspend political parties, reinstate rigid economic planning, and exercise control over the mass media.

All these measures obviously demand compulsion, sometimes coercion. It is likewise clear that Gorbachev will not agree to them.

This is why Soyuz, which insists it wants to act strictly within constitutional limits, has only one option for achieving its end. It is to secure the passage of a corresponding decision at a national Congress of People's Deputies.

The Soyuz convention approved a decision to press for a congress next month and collect the required 450 deputies' signatures for it.

The proposed agenda for the congress—an account by the president and an assessment of his performance—plainly reveals the faction's intentions.

Soyuz, generally supported by some 700 deputies, or one-third of the congress, can easily force the legislative session. But its ability to attain the projected goals there is questionable.

Constitutional amendments require the approval of at least two-thirds of all deputies. Even if it wins over a sizable share of the hesitant, Soyuz will find it very hard to get the required majority.

The outcome of the congress will most likely be a far cry from Soyuz's goals.

Extraordinary Congress Demanded

LD2104215291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2051 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] The second congress of the Soyuz All-Union Association of People's Deputies ended today. A resolution was passed demanding that an emergency USSR Congress of People's Deputies be called in May 1991. Soyuz deputies insist on the inclusion on its agenda of an account by the USSR president on his use of his additional powers to bring the country out of crisis, and also on measures to apply the results of the USSR referendum. The Soyuz Coordination Council has instructed one of its cochairman, Yuriy Blokhin, to speak at the next CPSU Central Committee Plenum to put the association's stance before its participants. Representatives of all-Union republics except Azerbaijan took part in the work of the congress.

Speaking at a news conference on the outcome of the congress, Yuriy Blokhin, cochairman of the Soyuz Association, stated that the main results of the congress is the transformation of Soyuz into an all-Union association, and the adoption of main documents: The rules, a declaration, and a program of action.

In Blokhin's words, the president must, finally, demonstrate his will, since the introduction of a state of emergency is his civic and moral duty. Replying to a question as to what the possible introduction of a state of emergency would specifically mean for the country's population, the Soyuz leader said that it should not frighten the population of the country since, on the one hand, public opinion is already prepared for this and, on the other, a state of emergency would not inevitably signify tanks on the streets.

Alksnis on Congress Resolution

LD2104180191 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 21 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—Participants in the second congress of the Soyuz parliamentary group favoured convening a special meeting of the congress of USSR People's Deputies to hear a state-of-the-union report by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

In his report on Saturday, Soyuz Coordination Council Chairman Yuriy Blokhin proposed introducing a state of emergency throughout the country's territory for six months, establish control over the press and over privatisation and strengthen centralised economic management to combat the crisis in society.

Blokhin's proposals found full support by participants. Not a single speaker disagreed with his opinion. After a short discussion, participants passed a number of documents based on the ideas outlined in the report.

The resolution on convening a special session of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR also includes a provision on the need to assess Gorbachev's activities as president.

Participants said the published draft Union treaty was "unacceptable" and favoured bringing it in compliance with the results of the March 17 referendum on condition of retaining its continuity with the 1922 Union treaty.

Participants passed a resolution on inadmissibility of signing the published draft Union treaty. They believe the signing of such a treaty will result in "disintegration of a single state".

Soyuz co-chairman Viktor Alksnis, who is a people's deputy of the USSR, told correspondents after the congress that the Soyuz Movement instituted today, will be in "constructive opposition" to the Soviet Communist Party's current leadership and to "democrats".

Alksnis said most Soyuz members in the country's parliament will support the demand to convene an extraordinary congress. Asked if at the congress the movement will demand that Gorbachev resign, Alksnis said "the congress will decide, proceeding from the results of debates". "I am personally for Gorbachev's resignation," he said.

Soyuz leaders have already begun collecting signatures to convene a special meeting of the congress.

Participants decided to reform the Soyuz All-Union Association of Deputies into a mass social and political movement. All those wishing can join the movement. Participants adopted the movement's programme and rules.

Perestroyka, Gorbachev Attacked

PM2304092791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[S. Oganyan "Notes from Second Congress of 'Soyuz' All-Union Voluntary Movement of People's Deputies and Their Voters": "'Soyuz' Favors State of Emergency"]

[Text] Today, according to the scheduled plan, Prime Minister V. Pavlov intends to submit the Cabinet of Ministers' anticrisis program to the country's legislature. But over the past weekend the "Soyuz" voluntary movement has already published its own program of emergency measures, which expresses mistrust of the government and the president.

The report by the leader of "Soyuz," a USSR people's deputy, was repeatedly interrupted by applause. Calling the situation in the country catastrophic, Yu. Blokhin indicated the need to struggle to strengthen our common

home—the USSR. For this, the speaker believes, it is very important to find one's ideological core. This can and must be the "Survival" program being drawn up by the "Soyuz" group. Even though it is still only being prepared, it is already clear, in the main speaker's opinion, that it will be impossible to fulfill it without decisive emergency measures.

What kind of measures? Blokhin believes that it is necessary, above all, to introduce a state of emergency throughout the country without delay, starting in April. For six months. And to resolve two urgent problems during this time: to halt bloody conflicts and successfully carry out the sowing. After urging people not to fear the words "state of emergency"—and, to judge by the ardent applause, they were no cowards who were gathered in the hall—Blokhin went on to expound what must be done to implement the "Survival" program.

They will be shock actions for the good of all, the people's deputy emphasized. It is above all necessary to ensure the normal course of the sowing campaign and to solve the food problem. Second, the internal tension in the country must be eliminated. For this it is necessary to suspend the activities of all political parties, including the Communist Party, and to disband some, the most radical ones...

To the deputies' tumultuous applause, Blokhin declared:

"If the president is unable to fulfill the program proposed by us, 'Soyuz' is ready to assume full responsibility for realizing every point in it."

The audience gave its unanimous support to Blokhin's call to seek to convene an Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies in order to hear a report from the USSR president there. It has to be said that the "Soyuz" group espouses a quite definite attitude toward the institution of the presidency: It believes that this form of rule does not conform with the system of Soviet power.

It also has a categorical view on the draft Union treaty: We do not need it. It is enough, Blokhin declared, that we have the 1922 treaty. A state system which has shown its bankruptcy over the years of perestroyka is being foisted on us today, the speaker said. The new Union treaty is necessary to those who have cut themselves off from the people's interests and aspirations and who seek at all costs to hold on to the power they have secured.

In his concluding remarks to the country's leaders and people's deputies, Blokhin expressed the firm confidence that the time has come to come down off the Kremlin Hill. His words and departure from the rostrum were accompanied by applause.

There was no debate at the congress. Each of those who spoke after the main speaker fully supported the propositions and conclusions expressed by him. It is time to call a halt, they said.

But how might this end?

IZVESTIYA Account of Congress

PM2304132991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by N. Andreyev under general heading "How To Avoid Catastrophe?": "'Soyuz' Deputies Group: Emergency Situation Will Save Us"]

[Text] The congress of the all-Union "Soyuz" deputies' association has ended. It was decided to begin the collection of signatures demanding the convening of an emergency Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The program elements of the "Soyuz" group were set forth by one of its cochairmen, Yu. Blokhin. The first and main task is "to struggle for the conservation and consolidation of the USSR," for which it is very important to find an ideological pivot. To this end "Soyuz" is elaborating a program for the country's survival and a strategy for its development. In Yu. Blokhin's opinion, the government program suffers from pretentiousness, and the program "of the so-called democrats" will lead to a fierce struggle which could end in civil war. The "Soyuz" program will lead the country through periods of survival, stabilization, and economic growth to the year 2005, into the world economic management system.

An essential and unfailing condition for the program's implementation is the introduction, as of April, of an emergency situation for a period of six months. " 'Shock' actions for the benefit of all are needed," Yu. Blokhin's speech stated. Why was a six-month period set? The calculation is as follows: First, we must carry out the sowing campaign in an organized manner. Second, as one of the speakers in the debates said, we must wage a "battle for the harvest." USSR People's Deputy A. Chekhoyev suggested restricting the emergency situation to a few sectors: the mining sector, sectors which produce military output, and the prosecutor's officer and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs].

Another group of measures should remove the sociopsychological tension in society. And the first blow is planned against the crazy prices.

The "Soyuz" program provides for the declaration of a moratorium on strikes. Here, however, an unpredicted circumstance arose. One of the speakers recalled that strikes are an effective weapon against separatist governments in some republics. But the question remained hanging in the air. Other measures include suspending the activity of all political parties (including the CPSU) and introducing control over the activity of the mass media.

Yu. Blokhin's speech devoted serious attention to measures to strengthen the state's vertical structures of power, for which it was proposed in particular to restore the unity of the banking system, ensure the unconditional transfer by all republics of their share of the Union budget, transfer of transport and communications to martial law, and create an institution of fully empowered

representatives of the USSR president locally... The list of measures then contains measures using verbs such as "ensure," "implement," "activate," "intensify," "render all-around support," and "we must widely enlist." Yu. Blokhin assured those assembled that "questions of development and the breakthrough into the postindustrial society are still at the stage of elaboration."

A thorough, full-blooded discussion took place about the future of the USSR. Yu. Blokhin's speech stated unambiguously: "We do not need the draft of the new Union treaty." The "Soyuz" group is entirely suited by the 1922 Union Treaty to which "it is not shameful to introduce specifications and additions." Of the new draft Union treaty it was said that it is being "persistently imposed," that it creates "an impression of deception." The main complaint leveled against the draft is "the incompatibility of the presidential form of administering the state and the power of the soviets." Also cited (not by name, it is true) are those to whom it is advantageous, those "who are impeded by our free and independent unified state, who see it as a raw material appendage in the system of the world economy."

In conclusion, Yu. Blokhin reported that "one can discern an increase in interest in the 'Soyuz' deputies as the last hope of saving the USSR." He urged people to "come down from the Kremlin hill and work in the thick of events, among the people, and to merge with them." This was approved by lengthy applause.

The debates proceeded quite stormily and left contradictory impressions. What was particularly striking was the variety of economic views, although there was no shortage of vigorous and uncompromising ideas. In speeches and interviews, Yu. Blokhin unequivocally expresses himself in favor of developing market relations. But that idea is not supported by a substantial proportion of "Soyuz" members. The majority of speeches at the congress suggest introducing stringent control over the economy. A. Prigarin, coordinator of the council of the Marxist platform in the CPSU, warned: "A bloc has formed between the masses and the entrepreneurs which could result in the overthrow of the system." He believes that under conditions where there exists an alliance between the elite and the working people, declaring an emergency situation is risky inasmuch as "the blast will be channeled in the wrong direction." A. Prigarin suggested restoring total control over prices, restoring the monopoly on foreign trade, carrying out destatization without privatization, and taking control over the press. As an example of the positive solution of problems, he cited the activity of Yu. Andropov: "When he became general secretary we saw order being introduced within two weeks."

V. Oskin demanded that a series of trials of speculators be held with the unfailing condition that workers are jurors. He suggested closing the borders to eliminate channels for the seepage of goods and also "returning to the people all the wealth lying in foreign countries."

Wishes were heard frequently during the congress for a report from the USSR KGB. The wish was granted. The gathering was addressed by Nikolay Sergeyevich Leonov, chief of the KGB analytical directorate, who ended his speech with a significant example from history: "Today every Soviet citizen wants to see the day when a session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies will equal the resolve and importance of the Nizhniy Novgorod assembly in far-off 1611 when Kuzma Minin with one speech raised up the country, created a militia (applause), and went to liberate Moscow, where they had gotten bogged down in intrigues and squabbles among themselves."

N. Leonov dwelled in detail on the activity of native "troubadours of separatism," as he called them. According to the information of the analytical directorate, "the tastiest morsels are being earmarked for them—highly paid lectures and big fees for articles and interviews. And for all this only one thing is required: that they revile their fatherland and call for its destruction." N. Leonov gave a clear assessment of the "troubadours'" statements: "In this case, foreign journals and newspapers serve as a reflecting mirror sending irritating flickers of hatred into our people's eyes. These interviews are done in order to organize the fattening up of a selected person and to pour oil onto the fire of our internal disorders."

The speech by the chief of the KGB analytical directorate had the effect of something like "shock treatment" on those present, promoting their perspicacity. "My eyes have literally been opened," acknowledged one deputy. Another demanded that N. Leonov's speech be distributed as widely as possible. It was decided to publish it in the "Soyuz" printed organ—the weekly POLITIKA.

For about a month now there has been talk of how the "Soyuz" group intends to convene an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The "Soyuz" congress put an end to this question. Although Yu. Blokhin did not even mention it in his program speech, the theme had become a leading one. The idea of convening a congress acquired real contours: the signatures of USSR people's deputies (let us recall there should be at least 450 of them) to the relevant demand. The main point on the agenda: calling the USSR president to account. Many deputies intend to press serious charges against M. Gorbachev. There were proposals to give the relevant instructions to the USSR prosecutor's office to prepare indictments against the initiator of perestroyka. Ye. Kogan tried to cool the ardor of these speakers: "Perhaps Gorbachev will give such a good account of himself that he will be thanked."

There were also those who were opposed to holding a congress. Their argument was that the people are tired of congresses. One speaker said: "If any movement wants to compromise itself, you can think of no better way than convening a congress. We must work." USSR People's Deputy Ye. Kim was skeptical about introducing an emergency situation, calling it a utopia. The doubt

voiced by USSR People's Deputy V. Yarin as to the competence of the assembly to demand the convening of a congress was not supported either. Someone responded to this by saying that "Comrade Yarin does not know the situation." Ye. Kogan expressed himself clearly: "Everyone is demanding the introduction of order in the country. And we shall not part ways with the people here." Eventually it was decided to convene a congress of USSR people's deputies.

Soyuz Said Trying To Stage Coup

LD2104143791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1134 GMT 21 Apr 91

["Commentary by Sergey Pustovoyt on the congress of Soyuz bloc deputies of all levels"]

[Text] In Moscow today the congress of Soyuz deputies of all levels continued its work. The purpose of the congress is to find a way out of the crisis in which our society finds itself. According to the Soyuz men, neither Gorbachev with his team nor Yeltsin and the so-called democrats are able to find this way out which the Soyuz leaders say is extremly simple. Some time ago Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, one of the leaders of the Soyuz group, stated that it would be sufficient to introduce a moratorium on glasnost and political life in the country, ban all political parties and movements—apart from the Soyuz association, of course—and introduce a state of emergency. Should that fail, it would be necessary to immediately arrest all troublemakers, mutineers, and demonstrators, and lock them up in prisons.

Note that these words come not from the hospital records of a retired Stalinist hawk who is peacefuly living out his days under psychiatric supervision. Vladimir Zhirinovskiy heads the Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union, set up in our country for the first time, as the "Vremya" program noted, although a party like that has already once been set up in our country. Only recently all of us have watched on Central Television a detective serial about how, using a make-believe Liberal Democrat party, abbreviated as LD, valiant Chekists lured to Soviet Russia one of the most evil enemies of the workers and peasants, Boris Savinkov. And here we have LD once again. What kind of fish is it going to catch this time around?

Admittedly, an answer to this question can be found from another leader of the Soyuz association, who invariably wears a leather jacket, Chekist style. I am thinking of Colonel Alksnis. It transpired that the so-called democrats, and in particular the inter-regional deputies' group, receive hand-outs, in the form of computers, telexes, telefaxes, from the American National Foundation for struggle for Democracy; and the Foundation, the colonel confidently concludes in an interview for the DOMOSTROY newspaper, is financed by the CIA. You succeed in undermining men of authority and unmasking those who conceal their dark deeds—when and how did you learn to do this, admiringly asks DOMOSTROY correspondent (Sergey Zvenkov). Anyway, his colleague Aleksandr Nevzorov had even greater success. Not so long ago, Viktor Alksnis told him of secret maps with sinister black lines of division of the USSR drawn up by rapacious imperialist special services.

All this might seem like a bad dream, were it not for the fact that, strangely enough, such declarations are echoed in some statements by the KGB chairman, the prime minister, and the president himself. Once again we have conspiracies, attempts to undermine and so on. It all looks especially sinister if we recall the words of KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, who reassured his namesake Vladimir Voronin, another leader of the Soyuz men: The KGB has the situation under control and proposes to use every peaceful means for stabilizing the situation, but it will meet force with force, stated the KGB chairman.

Incidentally, something about Vladimir Voronin. MOSCOW NEWS published a report a few days ago to the effect that several years ago, prior to becoming a leader of the Centrist Bloc, Voronin was a housing broker. At the end of March the Centrist Bloc ceased its existence, because nine out of the 11 founders of the block left it because of the extreme reactionary nature of their creation. And then the day before yesterday, the former housing broker and ex-leader of the Centrists, Vladimir Voronin, put forward his candidacy for no more and no less than the office of president of Russia, presumably planning, in the event of election success, to get down in the long term to the solution of the housing question in our common European home.

And in conclusion I shall cite the words of another Soyuz leader, Colonel Petrushenko. Answering a question last December on the possibility of a military coup, Petrushenko replied: There is no need to be scaremongering about a military coup. Even if a colonel were to come, it would be when they brought power to him on a platter and said: Take it, comrades, because we, civilian politicians, cannot hold onto it. Well, it seems that the colonel [word indistinct] is counting on a quick production in our country of a grand show in the spirit of Weimar and [word indistinct] German [word indistinct] according to the January 1933 scenario. Apparently the Fuehrer's call on Hindenburg with an ultimatum for the latter's resignation has already been rehearsed, although admittedly not very successfully so far. And the situation in the country, as well as in the world, is very different from the 1930's. But this does not seem to put off the candidate for a dictator.

Against the background of talk of the president's indecisiveness and the weakness of the government, the extreme reactionary and military-oriented Soyuz leaders, demanding that the whole of the state power be handed over to them, are in fact trying to stage a state coup. This cannot be underestimated.

Leaders Attend Lenin 121st Birthday Celebration

LD2204152891 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Lenin's thoughts and deeds did not lose their importance, Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, told a meeting here today, marking the 121st birth anniversary of the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

Ivashko said the anniversary was celebrated in conditions "when both the state and the party are passing through genuinely dramatic moments in their history".

Representatives of worker's collectives of Moscow and the Moscow region, party, government and public organisations, people's deputies, art personalities, soldiers and party veterans gathered in the Bolshoy Theatre, where the meeting is held.

The meeting is attended by Soviet President, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov, Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, chairmen of the Supreme Soviet's two chambers, and members of the USSR Security Council.

Gorbachev Attends Wreath-Laying Ceremony

CM2204151591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 April First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Wreaths Laid"]

[Text] Thousands of Muscovites and guests of the capital have visited the V.I. Lenin mausoleum on 22 April, the 121st anniverary of his birthday. Wreaths from the USSR Supreme Soviet, the CPSU Central Committee, and the CPSU Central Control Commission have been laid at the burial vault [usypalnitse] of the founder of the Soviet state.

Taking part in the wreath-laying ceremony were Mikhail Gorbachev, Gennadiy Yanayev, Anatoliy Lukyanov, Valentin Pavlov, Vladimir Ivashko, and other state and party leaders, people's deputies, and CPSU veterans.

Wreaths were also laid from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee, the Moscow City Committee, and the CPSU Moscow Oblast Committee. [Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 1103 GMT on 22 April in a similar report adds: "Today, on the birthday of the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, delegations of the Moscow City and Oblast party organizations laid wreaths at the Vladimir Ilyich Lenin Mausoleum. Taking part in the ceremony was Prokofyev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Moscow Soviet Committee first secretary."]

Ivashko Gives Speech

CM2304095191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1,2

[Speech by Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in commemoration of the 121st birthday anniversary of V.I. Lenin at Moscow's Bolshoy Theater on 22 April: "Time of Trials and Hopes"]

[Text] We are celebrating the 121st anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, at a time when both the state and party are experiencing a truly dramatic moment in their history. Therefore, reflections about Lenin are not simply an expression of traditional respect but an expression of the requirement for a profound interpretation of the past and the present. Lenin's thinking and deeds have not lost their significance for us. Lenin dedicated his entire life to a truly heroic struggle for a better future for our motherland and to social transformations for the sake of its peoples. This is worthy of thankful commemoration.

The artificial rupture of the ties between the historical past and the present day is agitating the public awareness and, on occasions, results in acute collisions. It is being used in a dishonest struggle, whose aim is to strike as painfully as possible at a society which is in a state of alarm, its culture and its dignity, in the interests, let us be frank, of self-publicity. Many are keen to put Lenin on trial, to put the history of their own people on trial, absolving themselves of any responsibility for what is happening, at a time when the country's fate depends not so much on the past as on prudence and a simple readiness and ability to live and work.

Lenin never sought to evade responsibility in the face of history. This unquestionably proves that he was a strong man, convinced of the righteousness of his cause. Lenin had a lofty and nobel cause, the altruistic and selfless service of his people. He dedicated his entire life to this, literally. In Lenin's view, this could only be achieved, in the Russia of the early 20th century, by means of socialist revolution. To be responsible to the people meant for Lenin, first and foremost, to set about tackling those tasks which life had set, and not to abandon the footplate of the locomotive of history at an abrupt turning-point, even if major unpleasantnesses and possibly even defeat lay ahead. Lenin never shunned dirty, thankless work. He did not try to shift the burden of such work onto the shoulders of others.

The October revolution was of course the main event in the destiny of Lenin's life. The year 1917 was one of the most dramatic in the history of Russia. The future of a great country was being decided. The monarchy was falling. But the new liberal authority, practically powerless, was incapable of resolving the urgent problems, of getting out of the war, of giving land to the peasants, of establishing civil concord in society and thereby preventing national catastrophe.

The various political forces and their leaders had a variety of views on ways to save the fatherland. However a majority of them turned out to be unprepared either to propose or—and this especially—to implement a program for getting out of the crisis. [Moscow Central Television at 1403 GMT on 22 April adds: Fear in the face of an embittered people, class prejudices and political ambition—all of this made them incapable of unravelling the truly complex mass of contradictions in this enormous country, which had plunged into chaos.]

It was indeed Lenin and the party of the Bolsheviks that proved to be the force that took upon themselves the whole burden of responsibility, and saved the country from the worst. One had to possess what was truly the highest degree of selflessness in order to move deliberately along this difficult path.

[Moscow Central Televison adds: This willingness on Lenin's part to take the risk of difficult decisions is not evidence of his political recklessness, as some people today try to convince us, but a manifestation of well-founded certainty that they were needed.] I think that those who today would overturn Lenin are lacking in precisely those qualities with which he was fully endowed: of not giving in to difficulties, but of taking upon himself the whole burden of overcoming them. Behind the attempts to make accusations against Lenin, therefore, one can distinctly see the desire of "critics" to remain on one side, taking responsibility for nothing in their own country.

Lenin was an outstanding politician and social reformer. He created a mass political party which was able to take power during a bitter class struggle. The new revolutionary power won victory in the civil war and withstood an onslaught of foreign intervention unprecedented in history. Thanks to the new economic policy, Lenin was able to put the country onto the track of peaceful construction. The head of the first Soviet government proposed and defended the formula of multinational statehood, one which was effective for its time.

He was responsible for the initiative of peaceful co-existence between states with different sociopolitical systems, a bold step aimed at strengthening cooperation between the peoples. Lenin's activity is multidimensional. Among politicians of the 20th century, his gigantic presence continues to strike one with its depth of thought and purposefulness.

It is sufficient to recall the difficulty Lenin had in convincing his brothers-in-arms of the necessity for a sharp turn-about in the political course after the end of the civil war, in order to understand that he inextricably combined the qualities of a scholar, a revolutionary, and also a sensitive politician who was able to find the right path to the target in the most complicated situation.

At the helm of the state, Lenin showed himself to be an outstanding organizer and reformer who was capable of coping with the most complex tasks. Neither the widespread dogmas nor the opposition of the left-radical position to the new economic policy prevented him from defending a course which organically combined realism and pragmatism while taking into account the urgent interests of the people to the maximum extent. Political common sense and sober calculation—and not canons established once and for all—inspired Lenin to recognize the need for an immediate transition to new forms of economic management.

This was an extremely bold step for that time. However, the supreme aims remains the same: the construction of a society of social justice. But the means for achieving these aims underwent a radical review. The pivot of the policy of the proletarian state from now on became the combination in practice of private and social interests, joint production, and mixed forms of economic management.

Lenin did not take his reformist ideas from "old" pamphlets, nor did he check them against Leninism as a sort of system of his own views. On the contrary, he caustically ridiculed any attempts to make reality subordinate to the demands of any doctrine, to draw practical decisions from abstract principles, and to blindly bow down to any authorities.

The state control of property in the period of war communism had its justification. But after the end of the civil war this emergency means of organizing the economy turned into a brake on the development of productive forces and endangered the very existence of the proletarian state, while in essence ignoring its real social and economic basis.

In full measure it was revelaed that it is impossible to achieve the necessary labor productivity while the old methods of management are retained, while there is levelling out in terms of wage distribtuion and an absence of sufficient incentives for labor and personal interest in its results, and while there is the inability to organize present-day production. Considerable efforts of great intesnity were required to reconcile the change in direction in economic policy with the feelings in the party and with the mass psychology of the workers and the poorest members of the peasantry. Explaining his position on radical issues of policy at the 11th party congress, Lenin stressed that one had to learn and seek to achieve a situation in which state capitalism in a proletarian state would be unable and would not dare to step beyond the framework and conditions determined for it by the proletariat, from conditions advantageous to the proletariat.

Essentially it was a question of a mixed economy, of the co-existence of two economic structures, of competition between the state and private sectors of the economy. The significance of permitting capitalist enterprises, concessions, lease-contracting and companies in which foreign capital was involved lay in the fact that this was to improve economic life in the country, to learn management methods, and to satisfy the requirements of the working people. Without in any way modernizing things,

one can say that Lenin offered the party an anticrisis program, having cast aside all kinds of theoretical dogmas. That was what life demanded. Financial crisis had to be prevented, the test of the market both internal and external had to be taken and passed, and normal economic links had to be restored. These tasks had absolute priority. The survival of the proletarian state, the preservation of the integrity of the country, and the satisfaction of the people's needs and its future depended upon their solution.

Enormous changes have taken place in the life of our country. It is impossible to mechanically borrow Leninist experience. Even the assessments themselves of this experience cannot be naively enthusiastic in seeing things through the prism of seven decades. We see the many ways of measuring this experience, we see its dialectial contradictions. Thus despite all his realism, Lenin could not avoid illusions. For some time he believed in the inevitability of world revolution and was captivated by the idea of accelerated communist restructing of society based upon enthusiasm. Lenin, as a theoretician, was one of the fiercest opponents of the idea of the all-powerful nature of "critically thinking personalities," but throughout the whole of his life he displayed an example of the enormous historical role of the personality.

Lenin selflessly served the cause of freeing the working people. But at the same time, he believed that a great goal justifies many harsh means, too. He realistically assessed the need to confront the system of autocratic dictatorship with the harsh dictatorship of the proletariat; but at the same time, he could not foresee that the logic of symmetrical responses in the struggle against the system of autocracy would objectively lead to fresh coercion, albeit anti-bourgeois. He believed in the dying away of the state, yet at the same time built a new statehood.

Lenin was categorically against over-emphasis upon ethnic peculiarities, but at the same time he consciously defended the uniqueness and singularity of all the nations of our multi-ethnic country. Before the revolution, Lenin rejected reformism as deception of the working people and compromise with the exploiters. But after the revolution, it was reforms that became his life's chief work. However, the historical role of Lenin is evaluated from the height of modern times, and one cannot dispute that he was a leader genuinely of the people. Lenin was indeed guided by the interests of the working people, and the people trusted him. Therein is the main source of his strength as a politician. His power was founded not upon the authority of strength, but upon the strength of authority. Both as revolutionary and statesmen, Lenin was profoundly aware of the new role of the popular masses in the epoch of industrialism. Mass social movements became at that time one of the determining factors in public life. Few politicians fully understood this new quality of sociopolitical reality. For Lenin, this fact was not grounds for abstract theorizing, but was a point of departure in practical action. Herein lies the secret of the astonishing effectiveness of his policies.

Lenin did not bow down before the spontaneity of the masses: On the contrary, he was a zealous advocate of good organization and consciousness. Lenin did, however, consider heeding the moods of the masses and adapting the party's tactics to them to be an indispensable condition of the success of the party's activities.

At the end of the 20th century, much of course looks different. Both the masses and politics have changed. Standards of behavior and of acting toward one another have become different. But Lenin's conspicuous ability to build a constructive policy founded on the actions of the masses remains to this day a model worthy of emulation.

A rare sense of proportion allowed Lenin in this situation to avoid such extremes as populism and voluntarism in politics.

The fate of Lenin's legacy is, generally speaking, a paradoxical one. The declared "upholders" of democracy repudiate it, condemn it, and demonstratively slander it while secretly plundering it and divining wherein lies its wealth and force. They cannot forgive Lenin his communist ideal at all. And even in this, they steal his Bolshevik methods from him, completely ignoring the most important thing—his limitless devotion to his own people.

Much in public life is transient, even hypothetical, but patriotism and faithfulness to the people remain priceless.

Dogmatism and nihilism are poor counsellors when it comes to appraising such an preeminent cultural phenomenon as Lenin's legacy. Other democrats often get angry with Lenin. They mock his memory, yet at the same time unthinkingly copy his methods in a changed historical era. Accusing Lenin of utopianism, they themselves hatch impossible schemes and foist them on society. They fastidiously disown what is called Leninist totalitarianism, yet in reality they think and act like robots programmed for a new dictatorship.

There are in the main two categories of people who put Lenin down. One group have never read his works but go on hearsay. The demand on them is not great. Others, on the other hand, have been totally absorbed with Leninism and spent half of their life canonizing his way of looking at things; but they then decide to dedicate the remaining half of their life to putting him down. The essence of their parasitism has not changed as they have done this—all that has changed is the method of feeding it.

The main thing today is in no way to be found in squaring accounts with your own past or with the history of the society in which we are destined to live together. If the experience of history does teach us something after

all, then first and foremost, it is that there is no means in politics that would be capable once and for all of guaranteeing people peace and prosperity. Politics is the art of the possible, and every new generation makes its political choice independently. In order to be aware of this concept, there is no need to be a genius. This is naturally accessible to everyone for whom the fate of the country, their homeland, inspires powerful passions and boundless ambition.

Searching for means of emerging from crisis, and for the way to a better life must be done jointly, bearing in mind that there will never be change if mutual accusations do not give way to constructive competitiveness and the establishment of forms of living which are worthy of our society and every person in it.

It is not just nihilism that is absurd, but also dogmatic attempts blindly to copy Lenin. The absurdity of these attempts is evident if only because we live in a different age. It is not the wooden plow and the peasant's wooden torch that characterize present society. The industrial world is moving toward the information age. The very bases of life have become qualitatively different. Truly, one simply cannot regard dogmatic fundamentalism without irony.

What we have inherited from Lenin deserves to be regarded much more seriously than nihilism and dogmatism. Lenin was a brilliant dialectician. It is particularly important today to remember this feature of his personality. Events in our country are developing so rapidly that by no means everyone always manages to find his bearings in good time, to take correct decisions, and to correctly assess various political steps. In general this is characteristic of a watershed stage in social development. The whole marvellous strength of Lenin as a dialectical politician was demonstrated in his feeling for reality, his ability to rapidly assess the situation that had arisen, and to find the most appropriate path to solve the problems that cropped up.

It was life in all its complicated and contradictory nature, and not dry dogma, which in the final analysis determined his political conduct. We can only guess how much mental and nervous tension it cost Vladimir Ilyich to perform this constant weighting up of the relationship between, on the one hand, what was ideal and theoretically calculated and, on the other, what was realistically possible in revolutionary practice. But we can say with complete certainty that it was precisely thanks to this work that the most favorable moment was not let slip for winning power in October 1917, which in its turn opened up—no matter how malicious our opponents are about this—a new page in our history and in the history of the whole of mankind.

It was precisely thanks to this work that not only Soviet power but also our national statehood was saved in March 1918 when the rapacious Brest peace forced us to sacrifice part of our territory in order to preserve our great state.

Precisely because of this work, a sharp turn was effected in the policy of the party and the Soviet state in the spring of 1921, when the new economic policy was adopted, opening up the possibility for a peasant country, where the prerequsities for introducing a socialist system were not very mature, to gradually but steadily advance along the socialist path. Lenin frequently exceeded his party colleagues in his understanding of the situation and remained isolated. There was in this both a manifestation of the tragic side of his life, but here also lay the greatness of his personality.

In our society profound and fundamental changes are taking place in the economy, in the state's and its people's relation to ownership, in ideology, and in the reappraisal of spiritual and cultural values. Essentially, the nationalities issue is being resolved anew. The role and significance of the state and of the entire state mechanism are being re-interpreted. An irreversible process of the democratization of all spheres of the life of society is underway. The country is freeing itself from ideological fetters that impede all-round and diverse cooperation with the world community.

These are all realities which even a few years ago would have been hard to predict, and it goes without saying that against the background of these fundamental changes, we should already take a different approach to the ideological heritage of Lenin. Having ceased to be a sacredly binding canon, it will undoubteldy become more attractive and appealing. Indisputably, Lenin was a great thinker and un unsurpassed politician of the 20th century, something admitted by his friends and enemies alike.

We now regard the pattern of social development throughout the world and different social and philosophical doctrines no longer just from the point of view of Leninist practice, but from many more dimensions. Today, we evaluate what is happening in the world not from the point of view of the violent revolution to legitimate at the beginning of the 20th century, but taking account of modern realities. In this way we are, as it were, rediscovering for ourselves all the outstanding thinkers of the past, including Lenin. But even in this context, Lenin's heritage never ceases to astound through its depth and wealth of thought.

In conclusion, V.A. Ivashko said:

Our society is today at a watershed. Its very survival is at stake. Was it not also like that in Lenin's time? No, not like that. At that time it was much more complicated. Yet the catastrophe did not occur. The people took heart. The state was strengthened. The nations came together into a unified union. And not the least role in this was played by the powerful intellect and the unbending political will of Lenin. The methodology of Leninist thought and action is an inexhaustible source of strength for all who strive for the renewal and progress of society. The name of Lenin will live through the centuries.

Commentary Praises Lenin

LD2204165891 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS World Service analyst Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The 121st anniversary of Vladimir Lenin's birth falls due today. A few years ago every birth anniversary of the founder of the Soviet state was marked by a whole spate of cultural functions: scientific conferences with long boring reports, festive meetings at all levels—from secondary schools to the Kremlin—as well as by numerous "labour initiatives" in honour of the great man.

Today, the name of Vladimir Lenin, which is inseparably linked with the 1917 October Socialist Revolution in the conscience of Soviet people, evokes unprecedented political passion. The balance has been tilted in the other direction. The erstwhile fanatic exultation and sometimes even idolisation of Lenin has yielded ground to equally unrestrained abuses and even outrages.

The fate of one of the world's greatest 20th-century personalities has been dramatic. Official Soviet propaganda has idolised him for the almost 70 years since his death. Since the beginning of perestroika, Lenin came to be regarded by certain sections of the population as the evil genius, responsible for the existing system and its principles. Those who believe the 1917 October option was a mistake lay all the blame for the country's sufferings and tragedies on Vladimir Lenin.

The denunciation of Lenin assumes various forms—from political demarches to absolutely uncivilised actions. For instance, Lenin's monument was smeared with paint in Krasnodar, southern Russia. All sculptures of Lenin are now being dismantled in Georgia, a Soviet Transcaucasian republic. Deputies of the Moscow City Council have removed Lenin's bust from their conference hall.

It cannot be said that these sentiments are shared by the majority of the Soviet population. Public opinion polls in 37 regions of the country, published in the weekly "GLASNOST", show that Lenin's endeavours are highly evaluated by 73 per cent of those polled. Fifty-nine per cent of the respondents believe the idea of the October revolution "was correct".

It is absolutely obvious that there is a shortage of culture and tolerance in the mounting political disputes in Soviet society. This refers, specifically, to the Moscow magazine "STOLITSA", which has reprinted the threadbare falsification that Lenin was paid by Germany. This is beyond all decency. Today, Lenin must be defended from uncivilised denunciators.

How can this be done? Not by administrative measures of course. Lenin's opponents cannot be stopped, for instance, by the presidential decree "to cut short outrageous actions against monuments, linked with the state's history and its symbols". And, of course, not by attempts to restore the godlike image of Lenin, as demanded by some officials of the CPSU apparatus.

Prominent sociologists believe it is necessary to study Lenin's works more soberly and unbiasly. According to Director of the Central Lenin Museum Vladimir Melnichenko, "we have always studied them with the help of mediators, popularisers and falsifiers".

Soviet bureaucrats have done everything in their power over many long years to fit Lenin into their ideological pattern and to exploit his teaching in their own interests. Professor at the Contemporary Social Problems Institute under the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Vladlen Loginov recently told a press conference here that Mikhail Suslov, Brezhnev's chief "ideologist" personally crossed out "unacceptable" passages from Lenin's writings when the fifth edition of Lenin's complete works was being prepared. And it was regarded as the fullest edition ever.

According to academician Pavel Volobuyev, the "internationalists" in power prohibited for several decades the publication of documents showing that Vladimir Lenin's maternal grandfather was Jewish.

Historians believe that only the truth can "save" Lenin, including the truth about his mistakes and misunderstandings. And this calls for a scientific approach, unaffected by transient considerations. "Time will put everything straight," Loginov believes.

Oversimplification of Leninism Scored

PM2204162191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Comprehending the World of Lenin"]

[Text] "Life is not a river, it is a contradiction." It seems as though the poet said these words precisely about the life of Lenin. About the life of a person, a politician, and a leader who frequently swam against the tide, against what only yesterday had seemed incontestable and unshakable but today has come into conflict with reality. He certainly was not being cunning when he wrote that politics start where millions of people come into operation, but he was not afraid to remain alone in a very acute debate if he was sure that he was right and that the cause to which he had devoted his entire being was right.

This was the case when, at the Second RSDWP [Russian Social-Democratic Workers Party] Congress, he had to uphold his own understanding of the party's organizational principles and to demonstrate that it is better for 10 working people not to call themselves party members than for one babbler to secure that right.

This was also how Lenin operated during the years of the first Russian revolution, when the party was enabled to emerge from under ground and there were arguments over new tactics and over cooperation between the RSDWP and the soviets of workers deputies created by

the masses. Vladimir Ilich advocated the need for a bold perestroyka of party work and for the resolute rejection of those forms and methods which did not correspond to the nature and scope of the people's movement against tsarism.

This was also how he acted at the time of the heated debate at the sixth (Paris) conference, in the struggle against liquidationists and otzovists [supporters of policy of recalling deputies from the Duma], preparing the Bolshevik party for the coming revolutionary upsurge and directing communists toward a flexible combination of legal and illegal forms of organization and activity.

Lenin swam against the tide when, on returning to Russia from exile in April 1917, he advanced in his theses the policy of causing the bourgeois-democratic revolution to develop into a socialist one and when, in October, he tried to convince his doubting comrades on the Central Committee of the urgent need for an armed uprising.

And then there were exhausting arguments over the Brest peace—a difficult and "shameful" solution yet, in Lenin's conviction, the only correct one for the sake of saving the Soviet Republic. There was an impassioned debate over the new economic policy and the shift in policy, which struck many party members as a deviation from socialist principles...

In short, this was how it was every time, at the abrupt turns of history, when life itself demanded that a bold, unconventional choice be made—sometimes one that frightened off even his closest comrades. It is no wonder that such a dramatic fate befell Lenin's last works, his "political testament," which raised the question of the urgency of the party's new perestroyka, of a "revision of our whole viewpoint on socialism." His ambitious "heirs" tried virtually to conceal most of that testament from the party and to interpret it in their own way.

For long years and decades the party was assiduously protected from knowledge of the complexities and contradictions in the fate of the great thinker and revolutionary and did all they could to straighten out his life and struggle by drawing some kind of ascending line of unreserved victories for Leninist thought, Leninist ideas. Like an epic hero, if you heed the textbooks and scientific works of even quite recent years, Lenin knew no doubts, effortlessly laid low his dim-witted enemies, and moved steadily on, carrying all along with him. Worse than that, the "continuers of his cause" passed off their own mistakes and errors as the consequence of life "according to Lenin" and of following his immutable course.

The Leninist party's enemies have found it all the easier today to sow confusion in people's minds because experience has shown that real life is far more complex than the greatest ideas and, of course, than the primitive Stalinist dogmas that were passed off as Lenin's lasting wisdom. And it seems all the more tempting to the present detractors to take advantage of the moment in order once again—they would like it to be for ever—to blacken the name and cause of Lenin and to try to deprive him of influence over the present and the future.

This is not an amendment for times which are undoubtedly making their own corrections to the assessment of Lenin's ideological legacy. It is the logic of the political struggle of those forces which have become active during the years of perestroyka and for which Lenin and the Communist Party created by him are the last obstacle in the path to power and to changing the polarity of the political reference points for our society's development. Not having a strong mainstay in the people engaged in creative labor and not expressing their vital interests, they not only make expert use for their own purposes of people's discontent with the disordered nature of life but also actively incite this discontent. They also seek to ascribe the present miscalculations, including their own, and the crisis in the economy and in other spheres of life to the allegedly originally flawed nature of Leninist and communist ideas.

We must not close our eyes to the fact that such methods meet with a response, and it is still more important to investigate why. Is it not, above all, because we have not studied Lenin in earnest and not bothered to comprehend the world of his ideas? We have reiterated that Lenin is as simple as the truth, meaning by this that the truth is always simple and does not require strenuous mental work or an honest, unprejudiced analysis.

No, the world of Lenin was not and could not be simple, for his times were extremely complex and extremely contradictory. The author of "Questions of Leninism" and the designer of the "Short Course" of the history of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) needed to simplify Lenin and his ideas. This benefited the expert propagandists who, having stripped Lenin's ideological wealth down into quotations fit for slogans, sought to use them to cover up the yawning gap between ideological goals and actual reality.

For many years members of the nomenklatura on a union and a local scale covered up their own incompetence and feebleness with references to Lenin's authority, assiduously bypassing what Vladimir Ilich had said to them: "A communist who has not proved his ability to unite and modestly direct the work of specialists by getting to the crux of the matter and studying it in detail—such a communist is frequently harmful."

Inveterate bureaucrats liked (and still do) to cite Lenin, and yet it was Vladimir Ilich who angrily stigmatized them when he said that bureaucratism is the worst enemy of Soviet power, warning that, if anything ruins us, it will be bureaucratism. Sometimes both overt cynics and rogues used Lenin and membership of the CPSU as a cover and as protection, even though he had had enough of them during his life and warned of them: It is the height of shame when the party protects its own blackguards.

Simplification in the past takes vengeance on the present. This is why it is so essential for us all now to really study Lenin, comprehend his world, and draw from his legacy everything which does not belong only to history but which can and must work to resolve the present and future tasks of creating a society of humane, democratic socialism. Here you cannot make do with a trite little apt quotation. One of Lenin's chief behests was to advance revolutionary science by verifying it against life and the experience of the masses. This is a direct mandate of the Communist Party, which Lenin warned against conceit and whose vanguard he urged not to be afraid to "work on itself and to remake itself..." Does this not sound topical today, when life itself has faced the party with the need for cardinal renewal and to draw up a profoundly scientific, innovative Program? And is Lenin's idea that the economy is the most interesting policy for us not timely now? It is no secret that the country's economy has ended up in a grave situation largely because communists have been debarred from influencing this sphere. We turn to Lenin and his ideas also with regard to the most complex questions of the party's work in the soviets. In other words, whatever sphere of our life you take, it will be useful everywhere to study the priceless wealth of his thoughts, observations, and conclusions.

Lenin left us a tremendous ideological legacy, and his very life has not lost and never will lose its significance as an inspiring example to communists. The life of a person, a politician, and a leader who is of interest to us in all the diversity of his seeking and finding and of his constant ascent toward the truth. A life over which we will always ponder and reflect in resolving the tasks which our difficult time of trials and hopes sets before communists.

Perestroyka Roundtable Held in Moscow 20-21 Apr

Popov, Bakatin, Ligachev Remarks

LD2104022891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1457 GMT 20 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Aleksandrova and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Apr (TASS)—In the course of the "Perestroyka in the USSR: Yesterday, Today, Tomorow" roundtable which began here today, eminent politicians of the country have been attempting to propose recipes to overcome the crisis which has struck the country.

The roundtable was organized by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and the Cato Institute (Washington), as well as a number of other organizations. This morning Vadim Bakatin, a USSR Security Council member, Gavriil Popov, Moscow Soviet chairman, Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, an eminent radical economist, and Yegor Ligachev, former CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, took part in its work.

In Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's opinon it is necessary to immediately reach an agreement among all the political forces in order to begin implementing a very harsh stabilization program with very compressed time frames. At the moment the concept of such a negotiation process is being worked out by the independent center for economic and political research which he heads. Grigoriy Yavlinskiy said that if this is not done it will be impossible to stabilize the economy and even by the end of the summer the country will enter a phase of gigantic social shocks.

Yegor Ligachev does not support a proposal for a forced transfer to a market economy. He noted that the attempt made by the country's leadership to accelerate this process was what led the country to the present crisis. He proposed returning to the intitial stage of perestroyka, when "things in the country were on an upward curve and a course of combining plan principles with the development of commodity-monetary relations was being pursued." Yegor Ligachev favors the restoration of belief in "genuine, scientific socialism" and stated that as before he believes in the country's communist perspective.

Gavriil Popov has a different image of the future. He believes that the new society will totally correspond to worldwide standards, albeit possessing characteristic "Eurasian features." The country's transfer to a new state, Gavriil Popov thinks, will take a long time and will demand strengthened administrative power to limit the powers of representative institutions. In his opinion, Russia should assume the functions of a new center. The Union can exist only under the leading position of Russia, otherwise there will not be a single state at all, noted the Moscow Soviet chairman.

Vadim Bakatin did not support Gavriil Popov's idea about intensely strengthening administrative power. He declared that the soviets have not exhausted themselves and they simply need to stop mixing legislative and executive functions. He advocates a police of "common sense and pragmatism," and proposed concentrating on resolving specific economic problems and avoiding ideological arguments. Vadim Bakatin also noted that the country's leadership should return to its former course of cooperation with democratic forces, and "drop its coolness with regard to them."

In the afternoon Ruslan Khasbulatov, Russian Federation Supreme Soviet deputy chairman, and Boris Pugo, USSR minister for internal affairs, took part in the work of the roundtable. At tomorrow's sitting, Stanislav Shatalin, Nikolay Petrakov, and other scholars and economists will speak.

Popov, Bakatin, Ligachev on Gorbachev

LD2104110891 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0630 GMT 21 Feb 91

[Report by Gabor Izbekhi in Moscow, including remarks by Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov, former Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin, and former CPSU Politburo

member Yegor Ligachev; From the "World Clock" program—Popov, Bakatin, and Ligachev remarks recorded in Russian, fading into Hungarian translation]

[Text] A stream of rumors can be heard about the political traps set up for Gorbachev. A number of facts prove that, according to many people, his time is up. Gabor Izbekhi sent a frontline report on the political battle of life and death.

[Izbekhi] All the president's men, that is the president's former as well as present men, were the chief characters of the perestroyka debate that started on Saturday in Moscow, organized by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and Cato, the U.S. institute of political science. Gavriil Popov, Moscow City Council chairman; Vadim Bakatin, former interior minister, and current member of the National Security Council; Yegor Ligachev, former number two CPSU man after Gorbachev; and Grigory Yevlinsky, an author of the shock-therapy economic program called 500 days spoke, after which I managed to ask three of them what they think about the political future of Mikhail Gorbachev, whether they can make him resign, or whether the time for his departure has objectively come. The first person interviewed was Gavriil Popov, who is now the closest to everday practical politics and at the same time the closest to Boris Yeltsin on the political palette.

[Popov] In connection with this question, I would first of all like to respond to Vadim Bakatin, who claims that it is unconstitutional to demand resignation. Well, I reckon that the Constitution allows the resignation of the president as well as the legislature or the government and it also allows people to request, to demand that. As regards the specifics of Gorbachev's departure, in my opinion it should be very accurately distinguished whether they want the departure of the person himself or the termination of the political structure that has evolved. This, of course, does not mean that Gorbachev will or may have a place in the political leadership in the next period. However, the battle now is not against him, but against the regime.

[Izbekhi] In reply, Vadim Bakatin, member of the National Security Committee and former interior minister, said that it is constitutional to demand one's resignation.

[Bakatin] It is the manner that is unconstitutional, in my opinion. For no problems can be healed by blackmail or the destruction of the economical nerve and artery system that forms the basis of any development. Gorbachev was elected president by the Congress of People's Deputies. Thus the method to follow should be that those who want his resignation should convene this conference and try to achieve their goals there.

I do not fully agree with the views of Gavriil Popov that here they are not calling for the departure of the person and only attacking the regime. They are indeed demanding the departure of Gorbachev himself, even within the CPSU, from Leningrad to Kiev; they also demand it in parliament, for instance the faction called Soyuz is holding discussions right now, although it has recently eased its views a bit by demanding from the president only the introduction of a state of emergency, not his resignation. But there are the miners and others, too—that is, everybody attacks Gorbachev himself, and demands his resignation. In my opinion these are all ill-considered, irresponsible demands, and it should be realized that it is about a very important issue. Gorbachev's possibilities have not yet been exhausted at all, moreover, perestroyka in the economy is just now beginning, or will begin after this, for it could not begin earlier because the political conditions for it did not exist. For this reason, I categorically oppose Gorbachev's resignation.

[Izbekhi] Yegor Ligachev, who himself will soon visit the operating mines as well as the ones on strike, outlined his view on the resignation:

[Ligachev] I think that the mood of the miners should not be ignored by any means: At the same time it is also true that the demands of a single group, even as big a group as the miners, should not be regarded as the mood of the public on such an important issue as the fate, the future of the president. As a matter of fact, what I am concerned about is the general situation of the party, the society, the state of the economy, rather than whether Gorbachev will or will not remain president. I can see that the technical-scientific gap between us and the developed capitalist countries has been continuously increasing and its consequence, I believe, is the country's greatest and most important problem today.

Economic Woes, Prospects Viewed

LD2104122891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] The roundtable of politicians entitled "Perestroyka in the USSR: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow", continued in the Oktyabrskaya Hotel, Moscow today. The morning session was opened by James Dorn, vice president of Cato, an American economic institute. In his speech he noted that the Soviet economy may develop in two directions: either a hardening of centralism, or an adoption of a program for switching to a real market.

Academician Petrakov then spoke. He called the program of anti-crisis measures proposed by Pavlov's Cabinet of Ministers a mechanism of violence. In Petrakov's opinion this program cannot be implemented in today's situation because it does not provide specific ways out of the crisis, apart from an increase in the state's economic power.

The next speaker, the economist Larisa Piyasheva sees the future of Russia as an agricultural country. She defined the way out of the economic crisis in two points: the privatization of property and removing the monopoly of power of the government over finances.

Scholar and economist Vasiliy Selyunin named as one of the main reasons for the collapse of our economy, the strengthening of the military-industrial complex. For this reason he sees the way out in the main by cutting military orders.

Academician (?Yemelyanov) devoted his speech to reform in agriculture. In his opinion it is necessary to return the real owner to the land—that is, the peasant proprieter—although the existence of state and collective farms as the main units of the agro-industrial complex during the transition period cannot be ruled out.

On this the morning session ended.

Shatalin, Petrakov Hit Program

LD2204130691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1957 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Unidentified announcer's report on the "Perestroyka in the USSR" conference in Moscow, including recorded excerpts of remarks by academician Stanislav Shatalin and Nikolay Petrakov, former economic advisers to President Gorbachev]

[Text] [Announcer] Academician Stanislav Shatalin spoke at the Perestroyka in the USSR: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow conference. May I remind you that he is one of the authors of the 500 days program which was not implemented.

[Shatalin] It is no secret that any government which is in power today has to carry out quite a tough policy. It must be careful and ensure that a social program is provided, know what our promises to people are worth, [words indistinct]. This government would be in a difficult situation and it would have to introduce not only popular but also unpopular measures. That is why, of course, as it was justly mentioned here, we need to form a popular government. Not a populist government, but a popular government which would indeed enjoy the trust of all people, a coalition government by all means. A government which consists of representatives of only one party will not be able to solve this task. [Words indistinct] Moreover, let us be blunt. This is the party which has a direct impact on the most grave socioeconomic, political, and moral crisis which our country is in.

[Announcer] Today again, like on Saturday, journalists asked all sorts of questions to participants of the roundtable. Nikolay Petrakov in particular was asked why he left the presidential ship. May I remind you that Nikolay Petrakov was an advisor, an economic adviser to President Gorbachev.

[Petrakov] Disrespect for competence, for professionalism is one of the features of Bolshevism, which is currently present in our society too. We can do everything ourselves, so to speak, and even that minimal professionalism which exists among members of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is aimed not at solving the crisis but at deceiving the people, which is very sad. I came to the conclusion that I had exhausted all possibilities to influence the situation. I entered Gorbachev's team at his invitation to implement a rapid movement of our economy toward a market system. When I became aware that for various reasons, which mainly have nothing to do with the real demands of our society, I could not carry out my functions any more, I considered it to be an unnecessary activity to be an adviser whose advice is ignored.

[Announcer] I would like to put this question both to Shatalin and Petrakov. In your speeches, in which you expressed your views on the provisions of the 500-day program, you said that the group advocating their own individual interests as well as some political groups are taking direct part in preventing the implementation of this program. Do you think these people who advocate their own special interests can establish economic dictatorship in the USSR on a strict basis of privatization and stem the influence of central planning? What recommendations can you give to such a person, if he manages to establish this economic dictatorship?

[Petrakov] Well, I am against economic dictatorship. I am for economic freedom. I do not quite understand what economic dictatorship is about. If it is a Chilean variant, or South Korean, then I reject it completely. We simply cannot go along this path. This is not our way. What should our state be engaged in, in particular? What is the essence of economic dictatorship? It is a policy of taxes and monetery policy and nothing else. The rest should proceed along the lines of economic freedoms. That is why I am against the ideas of some of our democrats, or so-called democrats; Bocharov, for example, who seeks to build a market system via economic dictatorship.

[Shatalin] I support this point of view in principle but I would like to say just a couple of words. It is true though I must have tired you with this proposal of mine. It seems to me that the only dictator that the economy, politics, and everything else needs now must be, excuse me for repeating myself, a coalition government which in reality reflects the interest of all social strata of our society. This government (?should be competent) and should reflect not only the interests of Russians, fascists, and so on. We need this kind of dictatorship and not only in the economic sphere. A dictatorship which is not afraid to implement some kind of major economic transformation since people still trust this dictatorship, this power of people's trust. How to do this is a difficult question.

More on Shatalin, Petrakov Remarks

LD2104160191 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 21 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text]) Moscow April 21 Tass—Prominent liberal economists Nikolai Petrakov and Stanislav Shatalin today

sharply criticised the anti-crisis programme prepared by the Soviet Cabinet, saying only a popular trust government could lead the country out of crisis.

They spoke during the round table meeting "Perestroika in the Soviet Union—Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow", organised by Soviet and foreign organisations, including the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper and the Cato Institute, Washington. Economists Alexei Yemelyanov, Vasily Selyunin and Larisa Piyasheva also attended the meeting.

"Only a government trusted by people can carry out strict measures to form the basis for a market economy," Shatalin said.

Earlier, Shatalin had been among President Mikhail Gorbachev's closest advisers. He was an author of the "500 Days" programme aimed for a rapid transition to market relations. The programme was declined by the Soviet parliament last autumn. After that, Shatalin left the president's team. "The Cabinet's programme completely neglects the existence of sovereign republics," Shatalin said.

Petrakov, another former Gorbachev adviser, said the Cabinet's programme is "purely declarative in its character and proceeds from principles of imperial thinking".

Conditions laid down by the Cabinet for realising the programme, such as a moratorium on all strikes, the restoration of a strict hierarchy of executive powers and a special regime for centralised distribution of resources, are an attempt to return to the state that existed six or seven years ago, Petrakov said.

"In fact, violence is the only method for implementing the Cabinet's programme," Petrakov said.

According to Petrakov, anti-crisis measures included in the programme have been taken from other programmes, including the "500 Days" programme, but they lack specific mechanisms for implementing them.

"Having no people's trust, Valentin Pavlov's cabinet will have to make concessions to new demands by various social layers to increase wages, which will lead to hyperinflation," Petrakov said. He believes that the creation of an economic union of republics and a "Government of national accord" is the only way out of crisis.

Selyunin and Piyasheva were even more radical, suggesting that the formation of republican currencies be started "aiming to protect people from uncontrolled money emission by the centre".

On Monday, the Soviet parliament will begin debates on the Cabinet's anti-crisis programme. During preliminary discussions in parliamentary committees this week, most deputies supported the programme, in contrast to economists at today's meeting.

Deputies believe that the programme is radical and well-considered. They especially praised measures aimed for financial improvement and privatisation. According to the draft resolution prepared by a working group, the parliament should take the programme into consideration, thus allowing the cabinet to move ahead [on] it.

Shatalin: Gorbachev Program 'Hopeless'

LD2104114791 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1000 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] According to Gorbachev's fired economic advisor, the implementation of the new program is hopeless from the beginning. Tamas Frey interviewed him during a conference break.

[Frey] A short while ago, at a conference in Moscow on the future of perestroyka, Stanislav Shatalin told Hungarian Radio that Gorbachev's program is unrealistic and thus, in knowledge of the situation, cannot be carried out. Gorbachev is building castles in the air, said Shatalin. These perestroyka spells have long proved to be of no use. In reply to another question from Hungarian radio, Shatalin, who at the time gained international recognition for his 500 days program aimed at radical market economy, refuted the guessing that started in Moscow that he would perhaps shoulder the post of premier in the event of Gorbachev's fall and the election of former Premier Ryzhkov as head of state. Thank you very much for your confidence, but this is more than I have a chance for, Stanislav Shatalin concluded.

Perestroyka Roundtable Ends

LD2104173991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] The Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow conference has ended in Moscow. It was organized by the Committee for National Accord, the Rome Movement, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper, and the independent Paris-Moscow University.

It would seem that despite all the irreconcilability between opponents, in the face of the danger looming over the country they are able to come to agreement. Even so, the results of the two-day debate at the roundtable conference of politicians show that the way to reaching an accord will not be an easy one. Each speaker saw the solution to the key problem—which lever is to be used to help drag the country out of crisis—in his own way.

Popov, Moscow Soviet chairman, sees it in the form of a special system of administrative authority for the period of transition to the market.

Yavlinskiy, leader of the Center for Political and Economic Research, favored a meachanism for stabilization through negotiations.

Academicians Shatalin and Petrakov, and economists Piyasheva and Selyunin cited privatization of property as the panacea for the woes afflicting the country.

Khasbulatov, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, suggested that economic activity should be de-ideologized.

The constructive dialogue which was proposed at the conference as a model for future talks among representatives of different political forces in society actually turned out to be a series of monologues, each talking about his own concerns, each denouncing various others—the center, or the democrats—and in the end each retaining his own convictions.

Republican Interparliamentary Conference Opens

LD2104111791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1034 GMT 21 Apr 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Apr—The organization of multilateral cooperation between Supreme Soviets of various republics belonging to the USSR is the task of the first interparliamentary conference which opened in Moscow today. Taking part in its work are representatives of the supreme legislative bodies of the Russian Federation, Armenia, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, and other Union republics. People's deputies from Latvia, Lithuania, and Georgia are attending the conference as observers.

This is the first time that a forum of this kind has been held in the USSR. According to Vladimir Lysenko, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy, chairman of the conference's organizing committee, and who opened it, the need for a meeting between members of the republics' parliaments arises from the fact that "the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet have exhausted the confidence of the people, and the time has come to establish cooperation between sovereign republics on an even basis between the parliaments themselves."

On the agenda for the meeting are issues such as discussing draft regulations for founding the conference, forms of cooperation between republics, proposals on holding a "roundtable" in which various political forces from around the country would take part, and adopting a statement supporting the workers' strike movement.

When the first interparliamentary conference is over there are plans to form a council of its representatives.

Republican Congress Continues

LD2204095991 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Forms of inter-state relations among Union republics will be a major topic today at the first interparliamentary conference, which opened here on Sunday.

The conference was convened in Moscow on the initiative of democratic movements of the supreme soviets (parliaments) of Union republics. Parliamentarians from the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Armenia, Uzbekistan and other republics are participating in the forum. Representatives of Latvia, Lithuania and Georgia are at the conference as observers.

On Sunday, participants submitted proposals on the agenda for a roundtable conference between representatives of various political movements in the USSR, a draft statement by the forum in support of the strike movement, and a provision regulating the interparliamentary conference's activity.

Despite the controversy surrounding these matters, heated debates did not take place, as the conference is attended by supporters of democratic movements in parliaments. Members of other groups did not send representatives.

After adopting the package of documents, participants are expected to form a council of representatives today, before the conference closes.

Delegates Urge 'Sovereign States'

LD2204182891 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Pooling efforts of the parliaments of Union republics for "the peaceful liquidation of Union structures" and "creation of sovereign democratic states" was declared the main goal of an interparliamentary conference of Union republics that is under way in Moscow.

MPs from the parliaments of ten out of 15 republics, who are opposed to central authorities, attend the conference. The republics are the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Estonia, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

The delegates proposed holding "an interparliamentary conference on the security and cooperation of Union republics". According to MPs, it would become "the best possible form of settling the entire range of current contradictions" between the republics making up the USSR.

Concluding a new Union treaty was discussed as a separate point of the agenda. Despite the fact that delegates of the conference generally supported dismantling the existing union structures, they failed to reach agreement. Some believed that future relations of the

republics should be based on a federal principle, while others see the new union as a community of "independent sovereign states" that would only consult with each other.

Admittedly, a round table of political forces in the country, at which the participants in the conference are going to demand, among other things, "the resignation of the Soviet Cabinet of Ministers and formation of a government of national trust", would help them hammer out a common position on this problem.

Conference Supports Strike Movement

LD2204195291 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The first interparliamentary conference of Union republics has supported the workers' strike movement and expressed readiness to cooperate with it.

Participants in the conference said in a statement that "without radical political changes in society it is impossible to satisfy the economic requirements of workers". They are going, jointly with striking workers, to press for "the recognition of the republics' real sovereignty and for the creation of the government of national trust during transition period" in the Soviet Union.

The conference also passed an appeal to various political forces of the country. It says, in particular, that "in connection with the real threat of a state of emergency being imposed in the USSR at the request of the 'Soyuz' deputy group, the interparliamentary conference appeals to labour collectives to go on a strike alert".

The two-day forum of the representatives of parliamentary factions, opposed to the Communist Party, ends its work today.

Meeting Concludes

LD2204205991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1930 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] The first interparliamentary conference of the Union republics ended in Moscow on 22 April with the establishment of a permanent consultative body of deputy factions and groups. Delegations from Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belorussia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, and Estonia took part in the work of the forum. Representatives from the parliaments of Georgia, Latvia, and Lithuania were present as observers.

The adoption of a statement on a roundtable of political forces was one of the important results of the forum, it was stated at a news conference held at the end of the meeting. The main task of this roundtable is to determine the conditions, timescale, and content of a peaceful, constitutional, and legal process of handover of power from the old Union structures, which have lost the population's confidence, to the new, democratically elected institutions in the republics.

TASS Reviews Central Press for 23 Apr

LD2304065991 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 23 Apr 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Today's newspapers open their front pages with reports about the fifth session of the Soviet parliament, attended by President Mikhail Gorbachev and Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev.

Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov presented the 'final draft of the government anti-crisis programme' to the legislature.

"The programme is based on the need to urgently normalise production links, revitalise finances and money circulation and form an efficient social welfare system," PRAVDA writes, publishing Pavlov's speech at the session.

The document aims to contain the Soviet crisis to manageable levels, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA comments.

Commenting on the government measures, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA quotes Pavlov's words that the implementation of reforms is conditioned on strong state power, which "we do not have at the moment".

President Mikhail Gorbachev, Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev, Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Soviet parliamentary leaders and members of the Security Council attended a ceremony, marking the 121st birth anniversary of state founder Vladimir Lenin on Monday, newspapers report.

Newspapers report tensions in the Soviet coal fields. Workers in the Kuzbass coal basin have failed to deliver 3,200,000 tonnes of coal, in Vorkuta losses from the miners' strike have exceeded 145 million roubles. More than 30 collieries are not working in Donbass, PRAVDA reports.

Miners do not plan to end the strike, miners' leader Anatoliy Malykhin told RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA.

The policy of non-interference pursued by Russian leaders Boris Yeltsin and Ivan Silayev leads to grave disruption in the republican economy, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments.

"The economic war" in the state they involuntarily promote is unprecedented in civilised nations, it writes.

After six months of tensions, the Cabinet and the Council of the Soviet Trade Union Confederation signed an agreement on labour, social and economic issues for 1991, TRUD reports.

Newspapers report ethnic clashes between Ossetians and Ingushes in North Ossetia. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and other newspapers carry reports from the North Ossetian capital of Vladikavkaz, where a state of emergency had been introduced.

Russian Communist Party Politburo Member A. Sokolov analyses the work of the Russian parliament and the latest congress of people's deputies in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA cover the Soviet-South Korean summit on Cheju Island.

Ties between Moscow and Seoul will help overcome confrontational thinking and deepen trust in the name of future Korean unification.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reports on the end of a conference on perestroyka reforms in Moscow. It carries an interview with President Mikhail Gorbachev's new economic adviser Oleg Ozhereliyev.

Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Vinogradov comments in PRAVDA about the role of the Soviet Communist Party.

Anatoly Karpychev comments in PRAVDA about the position and role of the Soviet president. The political opposition and party apparatchiks clamoring for revenge for their defeat during the first years of perestroyka want to "bury" Gorbachev, he writes, commenting on rumours about Gorbachev's forthcoming resignation.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about a terrorist attack by Armenian militants in which they shot Colonel Blakhotin, top police officer in Rostov-na-Donu.

In their international sections, newspapers write about Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev's visit to the United States and carry other stories. PRAVDA publishes an interview with commission of European Community Chairman Jacques Delors.

Need for Gorbachev's Resignation Debated

91UN1320A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15, 17 Apr 91 p 2

[Interview with Yevgeniy Vladimirovich Kogan, member of the Soyuz Presidium, by correspondent S. Boguslavskiy, place and date not given; and statements by Vladimir Samarin, USSR people's deputy, and Ivan Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union: "To Hold the President Accountable!—Demands the Soyuz Group; the Democrats Have Doubts; the Chairman of a Chamber Recommends Consulting the Constitution"]

[Text]

Yevgeniy KOGAN: "We Warned Gorbachev..."

The issue of the resignation of the president of our country may become one of the points on the agenda of a possible extraordinary congress of USSR People's Deputies, the convening of which many representatives of the Soyuz Deputy Group favor. Member of the Soyuz Presidium Ye. Kogan answered questions put by a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent.

[Boguslavskiy] Yevgeniy Vladimirovich, your colleague Colonel Petrushenko is quite resolute. He is in favor of convening a congress and transferring all power to a committee of national salvation. Does the entire group subscribe to this view?

[Kogan] We have not yet made a final decision as to whether a congress is necessary at present, and whether to demand a report by the president or his resignation. However, signatures are being collected in favor of convening the congress. On 20-21 April, a congress of the All-Union Soyuz Association of Deputies at all levels will be held, at which these issues will be considered. However, I stress that even if we come out in favor of the resignation of the president, then we will only do so on the basis of the USSR Constitution. To be sure, it is not ruled out that Gorbachev will yet take resolute steps; after all, his resignation is not the objective. The main point is to stop the disintegration of the country.

[Boguslavskiy] What does he have to do in order to "be reformed?"

[Kogan] We do not conceal anything. All of our grievances were outlined to the president at a meeting held on 8 April, incidentally, on his personal initiative. The future of a single Union was the main topic. Apparently, Gorbachev has a point of view different from ours. Judging by the draft of the Union treaty, our state should become a confederation or, worse yet, some kind of economic community. The draft does not contain even a weak guarantee for the ethnic minorities against tyranny by the proponents of "the primacy of the indigenous nation." Declarations of sovereignty, which openly ignore the unity of our state, are recognized. Meanwhile, this means nothing other than recognizing our disintegration!

We stated to him that we do not see a single program that has been carried out. Nonetheless, not a single person has been held accountable, and many have even "advanced." In general, it was a harsh and frank conversation and, I must say, a useful one. We saw this the very next day in the speech of the president at the Council of the Federation and in the resolute actions which have finally begun in South Ossetia. This is specifically what we demanded during our meeting.

[Boguslavskiy] In essence, did you give the president an ultimatum?

[Kogan] I would not put it like that. It was simply an involved conversation between people who are concerned about what is going on in the country. Incidentally, we told Gorbachev that we are prepared to support him, but for a policy and actions which benefit the state rather than because he is Gorbachev.

[Boguslavskiy] Are you personally in favor of his resignation or against it?

[Kogan] I am in favor of his resignation. You see, Gorbachev is intelligent enough, but still lacks something... Determination... Ability to hold accountable. This is perhaps due to the fact that he has not had actual management experience. All of his ideal theories...

[Boguslavskiy] Who do you see in his position? Yanayev? Lukyanov? Someone else?

[Kogan] I will repeat: If the issue of his resignation comes up it should be resolved only in a constitutional manner. Incidentally, I have always favored direct and popular elections of the president... Yanayev? I know little about him, we have had several conversations. He gives the impression of a more determined person. Lukyanov? He is "a sly fox," he has a head on his shoulders!

Be that as it may, the Soyuz group is not the only one giving this some thought. We are supported by sober-minded people interested in preserving the Union as a single state and interested in our country continuing to be a great power.

Vladimir SAMARIN: "Let Us Assume That He Is Removed. What Next?"

All attempts by the Soyuz group to somehow hold Gorbachev accountable, first through the congress of people's deputies, and now in the Supreme Soviet, are an effort to absolve the supreme legislative body, the USSR Supreme Soviet, of complete responsibility for events in the country and to hold the president responsible for everything, USSR People's Deputy Vladimir Samarin told our correspondent in an interview.

Incidentally, the Communist Party of Russia unfortunately holds the same view. It believes that if a politician with different views and a different orientation were in Gorbachev's place the present- day disasters in both our society and our economy would not be happening.

Directing the wrath and dissatisfaction of the people at one definite image is the basis for all of this: You are not to blame, but a certain individual is. As if the Supreme Soviet did not hamper the most reform-minded laws, as if the same Supreme Soviet did not nix the "500 days" program. Instead of assuming the portion of responsibility which belongs to them, and sharing responsibility with the president, the scenario of looking for something personalized and channeling the wrath of the people to it appeared.

All issues of resignation, of any resignation, should be associated with the issues of some other, alternative individual appearing or taking over this post. This should not be someone abstract. At issue should be a figure who has certain political credentials under given circumstances, a more definite program for solving existing problems, a way out of the crisis, and so on.

The second, constructive part of the question is actually lacking at present in the slogans of resignation which, incidentally, are being voiced by the workers movement and in the course of miners' strikes.

Who is capable of taking this place? Some say that the Council of the Federation is. However, two leaders, Yeltsin and Gorbachev, cannot reach an agreement in our country! How can we believe that a council in which Yeltsin and Mutalibov, and Kravchuk and Nazarbayev work will be efficient?

At present, the point is not to speed up the resignation of the president and the Supreme Soviet and the dissolution of the congress of people's deputies, but instead to decide as soon as possible what our leading organs are going to be like, how we are going to elect them, and so on. No strikes at all are necessary to make this decision.

Ivan LAPTEV: "Resignation Would Paralyze the Country"

Chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet comments on the situation:

Indeed, the Soyuz group, or more precisely, several members of it, submitted a petition to the session presidium some time ago. The petition suggested that an extraordinary congress of USSR People's Deputies be convened, the situation in the country be discussed, and a report by the president be heard... The petition was signed by about six people. After several conversations with them, the issue appeared to have been resolved. Later, it emerged again. Then, the press began to write about the collection of signatures, about the forthcoming conference of Soyuz, that the resignation of the president is just around the corner, and even about those who will be able to replace him in the opinion of analysts who are quick to make predictions.

As far as I know, a majority of Soyuz members ultimately decided that the congress should not be convened. It is enough to hear a report by the president at a joint meeting of the chambers, they said.

I absolutely agree that now is not the time to convene the congress. An extraordinary Russian congress has just quieted down, and we have seen how dramatic its course was. In May, the regular Russian congress is forthcoming. Later, there will be elections of the RSFSR president... Planting has begun. Strikes and interethnic conflicts are sweeping the country; the country is in shock following a price increase... To convene an all-Union congress under the circumstances would mean to completely paralyze the country, all institutes of government, and all economic relations. I am not exaggerating anything here.

Now about the report. How many times may we make the president give us a report? According to the Constitution, he must make an annual report on the condition of the country at a regular congress of people's deputies. This is the procedure.

However, let us not be sly. At present, there are many people, including people's deputies, who suggest that the issue of confidence or no confidence in the president should be raised. However, I would like to ask them: How is this in line with constitutional procedure? My second and equally important question is: What comes next? Let us assume that we give him a vote of no confidence... What next? After all, all political actions should be designed to produce some positive result. This is what I would like to know: Do the supporters of the report have a constructive program?

Soyuz activists advocate putting things in order; so, who is against this? At present, all of us are in favor of this, in favor of reinforcing all kinds of discipline, in favor of precision, concentration, and organization. It is another matter at what price. Perhaps, the critics have their own way to overcome the impasse? If so, they can discuss it in any forum...

A couple of words about predictions which some mass media are so fond of making. Of course, nobody has a right to ban any supposition or any version. However, it appears to me personally—and I am, after all, a newspaperman, too—that at present we are dealing with a deterioration of sorts of the quality of glasnost. There are many fantasies, unverified facts, and rash conclusions. There is a lack of tolerance for the opinions of others and hysterical intonations. Unfortunately, as a result, positions which were gained in the initial years of perestroyka are being lost, the first being the confidence of the people who are beginning to perceive that ideological and psychological lines are once again being forced on them, as was the case not so long ago. It is just that previously they were with one sign, and now they are with the opposite sign... It so happens that, having not managed to ever feel free, the press itself is voluntarily submitting to a new ideological dependency.

Gold Miners Strike for Pay Raise

LD2204144191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] A one-day warning strike was called today in (Kalyma) and (Chukotka) by miners of the Severovostok Zoloto, North East Gold, association. According to preliminary information, more than 3,000 people took part in it. Their main demands are a 100-200 percent wage rise, 30-hour week, and financial compensation for construction and acquisition of accomodation.

Presidential Decree on Developing Libraries

LD1304200191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev today signed a decree on immediate measures for developing the largest libraries in the country. Noting that problems requiring immediate resolution have built up in the development of the country's library system, the USSR president has resolved:

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers, jointly with the governments of the republics, is to ensure the fulfilment of previously adopted decisions on restructuring and strengthening the material and technical resources of the largest libraries. The Union Government and the USSR Academy of Sciences are directed to elaborate during 1991 a state program on ensuring the safekeeping of stocks of books and manuscripts.

The decree also provides for the acquisition abroad of technical means, equipment, and materials necesary for equipping libraries, and other measures. The full text of the decree will be published in the press.

Economic

Economists Discuss Anti-Crisis Program

LD1804135391 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The main provisions of the new governmental Soviet anticrisis program were generally approved at the first working meeting of leading economists which was headed by Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. However, sharp criticism was voiced at the meeting and concrete amendments of the document were worked out. Leonid Abalkin, Abel Aganbegyan, Egor Gaidar, Vladimir Kostakov, Nikolay Petrakov, Nikolay Shmelev, Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and other well-known scholars took part in the discussion. Prime minister's deputies, as well as heads of central ministries and departments also attended the meeting.

Donetsk Miners Remain on Strike 21 Apr

LD2204145591 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1745 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] Coal mines in Donetsk oblast remain on strike. Today, 44 mines and 8 (?other enterprises) have been working only partially or not at all. Our reporter was told at the Donetsk strike committee that the previous demands for the resignation of the USSR president and the dissolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies have not been revoked.

Meanwhile, the Donetsk town council has called on work collectives to hold a half-hour warning strike on 24 April, starting at 1000.

Miners Strike Shows 'Signs of Abating' 22 Apr

LD2204205191 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—The situation in the main coal-mining regions of the USSR has remained tense in the past twenty four hours, although the miners' strike showed signs of abating.

In the Kuzbass coal-mining region, Siberia, more than half of the mines and collieries stand idle. Miners have not unloaded more than 3.5 million tons of coal, including special grades, to their customers.

In Donetsk, the Ukraine, a meeting of striking miners, lasting several days, has ended. Protestors decided to send agitators to operating mines and other enterprises of the region to organise on April 24 an action in support of work stoppage for at least 30 minutes. However, the number of striking enterprises in the region does not grow: Out of 122 mines 31 stand partially or completely idle, and some of them have begun unloading coal to customers.

Miners of the Kursk magnetic anomaly, an iron-ore mining basin in central Russia, have stopped the strike and resumed work today. The strike committee told TASS that work was resumed after a strikers' delegation visited Moscow. In Moscow, it met representatives of the Soviet government who gave firm assurances that economic demands of the Kursk strikers would be considered in nearest future. In addition, local authorities have improved social conditions.

Reports from Buryatiya (Siberia) indicate that conveyor belts at the Kholtoson colliery have been operating at full capacity. The colliery operates in close conjunction with the neighbouring tungsten-molybdenum plant. Workers of the two enterprises elaborated a stage-by-stage programme on the assumption that satisfying their economic demands would take time. At the same time the plant has already increased wages and provides free food at its canteen. Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov has sent a telegram promising to receive a delegation of Buryat miners.

Some Mines Reported Back at Work 23 Apr

LD2304082291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0500 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] Irkutsk: The strike committees of the Vostoksibugol association have decided to maintain the pre-strike state for two more months, and in the future intend to act depending on the situation, even though, as a whole, the miners are satisfied with the agreement with the USSR Government.

Severouralsk: Four mines that had been on strike since 1 April are starting work today; however, the man on duty for the strike committee told the POSTFAKTUM agency that the strikers' political demands remain in force.

Yuzhnoskhalinsk: The workers' committee of the Sakhalinugol association has decided to continue the political strike. Only one mine—Yuzhnosakhalinskaya—is on strike now, however. The others have stopped the strike, deeming it not expeditious to their aims.

The same agency reports that, according to data from internal affairs bodies, 56 coal-mining enterprises in the Russian Federation and 61 in the Ukraine were continuing the strike on 22 April.

Baltic Republics

Latvian-Danish Contract on Oil Prospecting

LD2204220791 Riga Radio Riga International in English 2030 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] The Department of Geodesy and Cartography of the Republic of Latvia has signed a contract with their colleagues from Denmark. The contract is due to include prospecting of oil in this country and looking for subsoil waters to provide drinking water to several large cities, including the Latvian capital, Riga, which is periodically suffering from drinking water shortages.

The Danish side is contracted to pay a large part of the (Churmulin) oil prospecting project, which is due to take about three years to be completed. According to local experts Latvia possesses some offshore oil reserves along its western coast in the Baltic Sea.

Latvian Communists Commemorate Lenin 22 Apr

LD2204220191 Riga Radio Riga International in English 2030 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Local adherents of the communist ideology in Latvia today hold birthday celebrations of Lenin, founder of the Soviet Union. Members of the central committee of the Moscow-faithful Latvian Communist Party and army representatives of the Baltic Military Region laid flowers at the monument to Lenin in Riga. The minority communist faction of the Latvian parliament also participated in the ceremony.

Lett Group Supports Latvia's Popular Front

LD1904215191 Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT 19 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga April 19 TASS—"The Association of Free Letts of the World" pins its hopes on Latvia's Popular Front, its faction in parliament. This was the conclusion made at a news conference by First Deputy Chairman of the Republican Supreme Soviet Dainis Ivans and leader of the majority faction Janis Dinevich.

These parliamentarians, during their trip to the United States, visited eight cities with a significant Lettish population. According to Dinevich, emigrant Letts do not support activities of civilian committees in Latvia, but place greater trust in the legitimate parliament, linking with it hopes for the restoration of Latvia's state independence.

Lettish emigrant organisations, it was noted at the news conference, are ready to earmark 100,000 U.S. dollars as their share in establishing "Preses Nams" (House of the Press) joint stock company.

The controversy over the right to own the CPSU Central Committee's Latvian publishing house, which has significant printing facilities and which has printed most of the republican newspapers and journals, has been going on for over six months.

According to the data received at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, union arbitration has recognised the Communist Party's right to own the publishing house. The republican government is now looking for compromises to start printing republican newspapers and journals.

As to prospects for economic cooperation with Latvia, the American side noted the lack of specific proposals and unreliability of potential partners. "We must learn to conduct our affairs in such a way that we should be taken as serious businessmen," Dinevich said.

Lithuania Preparing for 'Emergency Conditions'

PM2204140791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent Yu. Stroganov report: "Ready for Rationing"]

[Text] Vilnius—According to a report in the newspaper RESPUBLIKA the Lithuanian Ministry of the Economy has been tasked by the government to prepare a program for functioning under emergency conditions.

Just what conditions do they have in mind? It is a question of what awaits the Lithuanian economy if it does not sign the Union treaty. Admittedly, the journalist for some reason refers to the relations which could emerge with the Union as a result of this as an economic blockade. Under discussion are the actions to be taken in the event of large power resources being lost, the procedure for cutting off enterprises from energy sources, and measures to maintain agricultural production. The Ministry of Trade is already prepared for a rationing system.

'Moderate' Opposition Unites in Lithuania

PM2304094391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Nikolay Lashkevich: "Opposition Takes Shape"]

[Text] Vilnius—For the first time since 11 March last year—the day the act of resurrecting an independent Lithuanian state was proclaimed—a real opposition to the current political course has been organized in Lithuania.

It is the Forum of a Future Lithuania, incorporating various political forces propagandizing the ideas of the moderate, stage-by-stage acquisition of independence: representatives of the Social Democratic Party, the Union of Liberals, the Democratic Labor Party, and other social and political organizations and movements and economic structures. In the main they are former

"Sajudis" figures. The leaders of the forum are critical of the Supreme Soviet's activities. They accuse the legislature of lacking a clear blueprint for the creation of a state, of indulging in political rhetoric and ritual, and of using confrontational tactics against the USSR. The forum urged all moderate forces supporting independence and democracy to unite. Henceforth this opposition association will be led by a 30-strong Coordinating Council. Incidentally, it includes six deputies.

KGB Reportedly 'Penetrating' Lithuania's Economy

LD2104033191 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] After a somewhat longer interval, the RESPUBLIKA daily has again carried a talk with an anonymous official of the KGB division in Lithuania. He maintains that the KGB leadership realizes they will be unable to hold on in Lithuania in the usual way for much longer. They are therefore penetrating into the republic's economy. The anonymous KGB official claims that there is at present more than one newly-established enterprise controlled by the KGB in Lithuania.

Vilnius Commemorates 12 January Events

LD2204210791 Moscow TASS in English 1926 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius April 22 TASS—One hundred days have passed since the tragic night of January 12, when the blood of peaceful civilians was shed during the seizure by the military of the Lithuanian radio and television building and the Vilnius television tower.

Hundreds of residents of the Lithuanian capital and victims' relatives and friends gathered near the tower after work today. They planted trees in memory of the dead.

Participants regretted that television and radio seized in January and a number of other important buildings still remain in the hands of the army, provoking tension in the republic.

Lithuania's Vagnorius Continues Canada Visit

LD2204161991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius is on a visit to Canada. There, he proposed that the West begin viewing relations with the Soviet Union in a different light, than it has been doing to date.

The prime minister observed that a positive resolution of the Lithuanian independence question, would also be useful to the Soviet Union, since the chronic nature of the conflict is unnecessarily intensifying the internal problems of the Soviet Union.

Vagnorius reiterated the request to establish in Canada a Baltic countries' information center and to convoke an international conference, during the course of which measures for the implementation of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian independence could be discussed.

During his trip, Prime Minister Vagnorius will visit the Canadian provincial capitals and meet with their leaders, businessmen, and representatives of the Lithuanian community.

Gediminas Vagnorius concludes his trip to Canada, with a visit to Montreal, tomorrow, from where he will return to the homeland.

Lithuanian Delegation Leader on Talks in Bonn

LD2204203791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] The visit of Lithuanian deputies in Bonn proceeded in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, said Bronislovas Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania and head of the [Lithuanian] delegation, at a news conference today while giving an assessment of his numerous meetings in the Bundestag. [They were] with Rita Suesmuth, president of the Bundestag, Hans Stercken, head of the Foreign Affairs Commission, leaders of factions, and others. He said that the TASS report about the visit of the Lithuanian delegation does not give the whole story. It said that the positive role of the USSR president in promoting the changes which have taken place in Europe was stressed by Germany. However, the fact that Bonn has no doubt about the right of the Baltic states to be independent is passed over in silence by the TASS report.

We were treated in Germany as representatives of an independent state which has not yet had all its rights back, said the head of the delegation. There is a limit to the [German] support for Gorbachev. Bronislovas Kuzmickas said he was pleased that a group of deputies for the support of the Baltic states will be set up in the Bundestag. Kuzmickas said that attempts by the Soviet Union to raise territorial demands, including the Klaipeda region, on Lithuania are unfounded. There is no doubt in Bonn that this region has legally integrated into the Lithuanian territory.

Lithuanian Defense Chief Visits Sweden, UK

LD2204100191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0600 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Audrius Butkevicius, general director of the Lithuanian State Defense Department, in the course of two meetings in Sweden met with social defense specialists and expert Sovietologists. On Friday [19 April], he arrived in London, where he presently remains.

Yesterday, he met with the deputy director of the Institute for Strategic Studies, [words indistinct]. Following Mr. Butkevicius' presentation on Lithuania's security

regulations, [words indistinct] replied that he and the British strategists understand that the Lithuanians are a pragmatic and restrained people who are determined to conduct a [word indistinct] policy.

Today, Audrius Butkevicius will meet with representatives of Great Britain's internal affairs and foreign affairs ministries.

We were provided this information by Lithuanian radio correspondent Arkadijus Vinokuras from London.

Baltic Deputies Prepare for Military Talks

LD1904220191 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT 19 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev; all quotation marks as received]

[Text] Riga April 19 TASS—Some Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian parliamentarians believe that the presence of Soviet Armed Forces on the territory of the Baltic republics is "a destabilising factor" politically and economically, and they should therefore be withdrawn. This conclusion was made in a document, entitled "Recommendations for Talks With the USSR on Military Matters", drawn up by groups of deputies and experts from the three Baltic republics.

The document says that "Soviet troops, while staying in the republic, are forbidden to conduct activities which affect republican sovereignty and which constitute interference in republican domestic affairs. The USSR should undertake all expenses involved in the upkeep of Soviet troops on republican territory".

Major-General A. Vodopiyanov, first deputy chief of the military-political administration of the Red Banner Baltic military district, said, commenting on the document: "According to the president's decree, delegations have been formed to discuss political, social and economic matters with representatives of the Baltic republics. The first meetings have already been held, outlining the issues for discussion in order to find points of contact.

"As for Latvia, the interests of the Soviet Armed Forces are represented by Army General Valentin Varennikov, deputy defence minister. During the first meeting with representatives of the republican government it was noted that 'the question of troop withdrawal is not on the agenda'.

"It is clear to every sober-minded politician that the removal of the military presence from the Baltic territory would adversely affect the balance of forces in Europe, which we cannot tolerate. One should not forget that Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, despite declarations by separate politicians, are, as before, part of the USSR, and military strategy issues are within the jurisdiction of the centre."

RSFSR

North Ossetia Declares State of Emergency

LD2004144991 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 20 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 20 TASS—A session of the Supreme Soviet of North Ossetia adopted today a resolution on imposing a state of emergency on the Prigorodny region and the city of Vladikavkaz.

The resolution was adopted as a result of a dramatic aggravation of tension in the Prigorodny region, where armed clashes between ethnic Ingushs and Ossetians took place in the village of Kurtat on April 19. Those developments negatively affected the situation in Vladikavkaz.

Militia details, officers of law enforcement agencies and North Ossetian senior executives came to the scene of the conflict. Yu. Biragov, first deputy chairman of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet, told TASS. A delegation of the Chechen-Ingush republic from the city of Grozniy and senior executives of the neighbouring Nazran region, Chechen-Ingushetia, came to Kurtat in the evening. Nevertheless, clashes continued until the morning of April 20. Several local residents and officers of the North Ossetian Interior Ministry were wounded. Participants in the clashes captured from militiamen submachine guns and revolvers.

The Ossetian leadership informed the Soviet president, the Soviet and Russian parliaments and the Soviet Interior Ministry of this situation.

Ethnic Strife, Injuries Reported

AU2204163991 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] A resolution on the introduction of a state of emergency in the city of Vladikavkaz and suburban areas was adopted by the session of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet. The authorities were compelled to resort to this measure because of the sharp exacerbation of the situation in the suburban areas. For example, on 19 April, armed confrontations took place between persons of Ingush and Ossetian nationalities in the village of (?Surkato), and this led to a further exacerbation of the situation in Vladikavkaz. As (?Gunaga), first deputy chairman of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet, told TASS correspondents, militia squads, workers of law enforcement organs, and leaders of North Ossetia arrived at the place of the conflict. In the evening, delegates from Checheno-Ingushetia and the leaders of the Nazrani Rayon near Checheno-Inghshetia arrived in (?Surkato). Despite this, clashes continued until the morning of 20 April. Several local residents, as well as workers of the North Ossetian Ministry of Internal Affairs, were seriously wounded. Their submachine guns and authorized pistols were taken from them by the

participants in the conflict. The leadership of South Ossetia reported the situation to the USSR president, the supreme soviets of the USSR and of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

'Sharply Deteriorating Situation'

LD2204120491 Moscow TASS in English 1145 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 22 TASS—A state of emergency was introduced in Vladikavkaz, the capital of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic from April 19 to May 19 by a republican parliamentary decree. A curfew was also imposed on the capital's suburbs.

"These measures were taken due to the sharply deteriorating situation in Vladikavkaz and its suburbs where there were armed clashes between Ingushes and Ossets during which many have been wounded," Akhsarbek Galazov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the North Ossetian Republic, told TASS.

A conflict started in Kurtat village. Dzotov, an Ossetian mechanic at the Lenin collective farm, was tilling his private plot when Kotiyev, an Ingush, started making unjustifiable claims. They had a brawl.

The incident took on new dimensions, as Ingushes and Ossets arrived in Kurtat in from other districts. Fighting broke out, firearms and blank weapons were used.

Units of police, law enforcement officials, and leaders of North Ossetia arrived at the village, but fighting continued throughout the night. Dozens of peaceful people and policemen were gravely wounded. That it is a miracle that the bloodshed is not explode into something worse. [sentence as received]

Leaders of North Ossetia reported the conflict to the Soviet president, parliaments of the USSR and the Russian Federation, and USSR Interior Ministry. Additional units of Interior Ministry troops arrived in the area at the request of the republic's leadership.

The people of North Ossetia positively reacted to the introduction of a state of emergency and curfew in the suburbs.

Last night was relatively quiet in the suburb of Vladikavkaz and in the capital. There were skirmishes in Kurtat, Kambilevskoye and Oktyabrskoye villages, leaving some wounded. Several curfew violators were detained.

Further Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to France

Mitterrand Aide Comments

PM1904141391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Union Edition p 7

[Correspondent Yu. Kovalenko report: "B.N. Yeltsin in France"]

[Text] Paris—"I consider that the main tasks of my visit to Strasbourg and Paris which I set before leaving have been fulfilled," B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, stated at a final news conference in the French capital. "The visit showed that a basis is beginning to emerge for the possibility of Russia's real integration in the European political, economic, and legal space. This process is beginning to be realized by various political forces which are all following with great interest the development of events in Russia and in our country...."

In Paris, Yeltsin met with L. Fabius, speaker of the French National Assembly, J. Lecanuet, chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Armed Forces Commission, and representatives of business circles. Finally he was received by J.-L. Bianco, secretary general of the Elysee Palace, and there was a short conversation with President Mitterrand. (I would note that quite by chance Yeltsin arrived at the head of state's residence 30 minutes after [USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman] A.I. Lukyanov left it).

It was unclear until the last moment whether there would be a meeting between the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the French president. Commenting on this meeting which, in the words of the French press, the guest himself requested, Elysee spokesman H. Vedrine noted: Yeltsin represents the Russian republic, and we received him in that capacity. But let there be no doubt here, Vedrine stressed, that the president of the USSR is M.S. Gorbachev and it is with him that the leaders of the whole world deal when discussing questions affecting that country. However, this does not prevent contacts with the leaders of other Soviet republics.

European Parliament 'Insult' Cited

PM2204133991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Bolshakov report: "In Strasbourg and Paris. Yeltsin's Trip to France"]

[Excerpts] Paris—[passage omitted] The guest spent two days in Strasbourg, where he was received by the leaders of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe, and by the leaders of the main parliamentary groups. In Paris he had brief meetings with L. Fabius, speaker of the French National Assembly, and was received at the Elysee Palace.

B.N. Yeltsin and those accompanying him strove in every possible way to give the visit an official feel. Thus, at a news conference yesterday Yeltsin stated that "protocol will be exceeded" and that he would be received at the Elysee Palace. Indeed, he was received by Jean-Louis Bianco, secretary general of the Elysee Palace. "President Mitterrand," the newspaper LIBERATION wrote today, "simply looked in to shake his hand during this meeting." [passage omitted]

His discussion with the deputies' group of socialists at the European Parliament was "very sharp." Here I should state that restraint was displayed more by Yeltsin than by his interlocutors, since Jean-Pierre Cot, the leader of the group, virtually showed him the door. This was at the very least unworthy of a figure of such magnitude and an insult to each of Russia's 150 million inhabitants—irrespective of whether they approve of Yeltsin's views or not. [passage omitted]

Polozkov Interviewed, Says People Want 'Order'

PM2304081891 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 21-22 Apr 91 p 13

[Interview with Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, by Fiammetta Cucurnia in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—"This is not the time for reforms. We must think about the future, salvage the country, and restore its stability. If the CPSU leadership makes concrete proposals in this direction, then we can continue working together." On the eve of the 24 April CPSU Central Committee Plenum Ivan Polozkov—first secretary of the Russian Communist Party, Boris Yeltsin's enemy number one, and leader of the Communist group in the Russian legislature—explained why his party is planning to issue Gorbachev an ultimatum. Sitting in his large office on Old Square he spoke resolutely, accompanying his remarks with frequent lively glances. He looked like someone determined to fight to the end to defend a "socialism" that the USSR no longer seems to want.

[Cucurnia] Ivan Kuzmich, there has been evidence recently of the party's definite irritation with General Secretary Gorbachev. Major local organizations have called explicitly for his dismissal from the top CPSU post. Do you believe that such feelings are very strong and widespread?

[Polozkov] Yes, they are. And not without reason. Indeed, on one hand our party has declared itself to be—and is—the leading party, which for many decades exercised its power under monopoly conditions. People are accustomed to turning to this party with their problems and needs. Now, as the country is witnessing the collapse and disintegration of all the existing economic relations, people still turn to the party, calling it to account for the situation. On the other hand you must keep in mind that in our country the same person combines the two posts of president and general secretary. But there are many men in the president's entourage whose beliefs and theories are not consistent either with those of socialism—which, for that matter, we no longer claim—or with our country's actual conditions. They forget that we have become what we are over a period of more than 70 years' existence, and to demand now the immediate privatization of all the economic structures is the worst kind of irresponsibility.

[Cucurnia] So you do not approve of the reforms of perestroyka in the direction of privatization and the market economy.

[Polozkov] The right—which in our country, for some reason, calls itself the "left"—refuses to realize that people in our country have grown up in a different kind of situation: Our engineers may not have earned much, but they were used to that salary and would plan their spending on the basis of that fact. Anyone can see that it will take time to move our people into a radically different kind of life now. Especially if we are talking about the entire economic system. This is the essence of the disagreement between us and the "extremists of perestroyka." They are to blame for the chaos that they have created. We were better off in 1986 when perestroyka was still moving up. The chaos started in 1988 when alongside Gorbachev there appeared a team oriented exclusively toward the West, the market economy, and privatization.

[Cucurnia] How much of the blame do you believe should be put on Gorbachev?

[Polozkov] The general secretary and president was the initiator of perestroyka. He, together with his "team," bears the responsibility for the successes and failures of this policy. Gorbachev is an expert politician who enjoys great prestige around the world. But people are tired of chaos and destruction; they want order. All the country's leaders must realize this. The more resolutely Gorbachev acts for the sake of stabilization, the greater the party's and the people' support will be.

[Cucurnia] In a few days' time there will be an important session of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. Is anybody thinking of changing the party leadership?

[Polozkov] This is a very difficult question. I will answer you with a Russian proverb: "I khochetsya, i koletsya"—the temptation exists, but there are many uncertainties. On the one hand the rumors spread by the newspapers are definitely exaggerated. On the other hand there is a real panic. The political atmosphere really is very tense. Nevertheless we must let ourselves be guided by a sense of political appropriateness. The issue now is not perestroyka but the stabilization of society. If at the plenum I am again presented with a proposal of a plan for privatization, the sale of houses, a job market, and social guarantees, I will reply: "Brothers, pardon me, but you're living on another planet." [closed quote marks as published] I want to know what's going to happen in a week's time, in a month and a half, in six months' time. How

can we resolve the paradox facing us, whereby on the one hand grain is not being used, while in some cities there is not enough flour to bake bread? If you cannot reply, then let's forget it. Or listen, because there are people who do have something to put forward. This is what we must talk about at the plenum.

[Cucurnia] So has no decision not yet been reached, and does everything depend on what proposals the general secretary presents?

[Polozkov] We must consider the future. Until recently our country was a great world power. A country with a huge potential that suddenly found itself on its knees in the role of a beggar. Was there some natural disaster, a conflagration? No. So it is inevitable to wonder whether it really was necessary to permit such a degeneration for the sake of the transition to a market economy. I have been saying this for at least five years, and I do not intend to consider myself partly to blame, together with the members of the "team" that permitted all this.

[Cucurnia] Do you believe that others could handle this stage better than Gorbachev? Who, in your opinion?

[Polozkov] I definitely do not believe any such thing. As for a resignation, I would avoid exaggerating the fact that it being talked about. Politicians' elections and resignations are normal events in a state's life. Be that as it may, I am convinced that the secretary of the ruling party—and note that I did not say the CPSU—is bound in any case to be also the president of the country, if not officially then at least de facto. In this specific instance you will have noticed that the political groups themselves approach the issue differently, depending on the situation and on political conditions. This is why I consider it neither opportune nor helpful to discuss now who could occupy the supreme party and state post in the future. There are very many talented people in our country, as in all others.

[Cucurnia] If your description is accurate and the country really is not ready to cope with a rapid transition to a market economy and privatization, how do you explain Yeltsin's popularity?

[Polozkov] The Yeltsin phenomenon is explained by the fact that he is able to proclaim his policy forcefully and confidently. People have had enough of disorder and the government's weakness. Boris Nikolayevich knows how to impose his will. And people realize this.

[Cucurnia] At the latest congress of Russian deputies Yeltsin scored a victory over your line. What do you think of that?

[Polozkov] If you compare the proposals that Yeltsin presented at the congress with the final document, you will see that many of them were not taken up by the deputies. For instance, the resolution on the program to combat the crisis contains chiefly formulations put forward not by Yeltsin but by the "Russian Communists" group.

[Cucurnia] Nevertheless Yeltsin did succeed in defeating the Communist opposition on the issue closest to his heart—the election of the Russian president next 12 June.

[Polozkov] The issue is by no means decided. We published our alternative plan for the election of the Russian president to create equal conditions for all candidates, not just for one. It all has yet to be discussed next week by the Russian Supreme Soviet.

[Cucurnia] Do you believe that the Communist faction will be numerically strong enough to postpone this decision?

[Polozkov] I am optimistic: If we do not succeed in the Supreme Soviet, we will do so at the May congress.

[Cucurnia] So why did you not succeed in blocking the decision at the previous congress?

[Polozkov] We had no intention of doing so. We are Russians, too, and we have a sense of dignity. If Moldavia has a president, why should Russia not have one? This is the point. Even though a single president should be enough, and is in fact already too much. In 1,000 years of history Russia never had a president. And yet it survived.

[Cucurnia] But at the congress the Communist Party witnessed its first real split, which is accompanied by a large loss of members. Is this crisis irreversible?

[Polozkov] I see no grounds for saying so. Indeed, the decline in membership has recently slowed and in fact a new influx has started, reflecting the renewal. As for the "communist split" at the Russian congress, it is not the result of an actual crisis. Indeed, less than 100 people joined the new group, almost all of them from a group already close to the Democratic Russia group. Very few people have left the communist group.

[Cucurnia] To what date do you want to shift the election of the Russian president?

[Polozkov] It will take as long as is needed for all the candidates to be able to carry out a real election campaign—two, three, may be four months.

[Cucurnia] Who is the Russian Communist Party's candidate?

[Polozkov] I cannot tell you. I'd be glad to do so, because he will be a worthy person, a genuine Russian chosen from among many candidates. But if I were to name names now, the Soviet newspapers would use this interview to cover him in insults and discredit him in the people's eyes, as they have done with me.

[Cucurnia] I have heard a lot of talk about the young Sergey Baburin.

[Polozkov] Oh, he's a charming youngster. Young, handsome, well educated, and capable. I believe he really does represent the future of the party and of Russia.

'Democratic Russia' Meeting Views 26 Apr Strike

LD2204181191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Summary] An all-Moscow meeting of the production sections of the Democratic Russia movement is being held today. The issue of Moscow enterprises joining the all-Russian strike set by the Federation of Independent Russian Trade Unions for 26 April is to be resolved at the meeting. The Democratic Russia coordinating council is proposing that an appeal to the republic's labor collectives be adopted. The appeal says that the policies of the Union authorities have brought the people to destitution, and for this reason Democratic Russia calls on workers to take part in the 26 April strike and to support all the political demands of the striking miners.

U.S. To Be Offered Most-Favored-Nation Status

LD2004133591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Text] Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev is arriving in the United States on a visit. He will inform the official circles of this country that the leadership of the Russian Federation is prepared to offer the United States the most-favored-nation status for the investment of the Western capital and the importation of finished goods into our republic. The signing of contracts for grain supplies to Russia is also planned.

Dissident Bukovskiy Interviewed During Visit

LD1904110591 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] The leading human rights campaigner and dissident Mr. Vladimir Bukovskiy, who was imprisoned in the early 1970s' and swapped in 1976 for the Chilean Communist leader Mr. Luis Carvalan, is now in Moscow on invitation by Democratic Russia's publishers. Mr. Bukoskiy, who is a Cambridge lecturer living in London, has come for the first time since he was expelled from the Soviet Union 15 years ago. He held a news conference at the Democratic Russia publishers yesterday. Here is an excerpt from his speech:

He said that after an on-the-spot assessment he would like to help those who qualified for such assistance. Mr. Bukovskiy meant those who continue the course he and his associates began 30 years ago. However he was amazed that the general atmosphere in the country was passive. A recent poll, he said, showed that 70 per cent of the age group between 18 and 25 would like to emigrade to the West, which is disgraceful. Mr. Bukovskiy said he was ready to give a helping hand to anyone, regardless of his past—his former prison warden, or KGB investigator—provided he is a patriot willing to serve his country. Mr. Bukovskiy was speaking at a news conference in Moscow lasting nearly two hours.

He was speaking afterwards with Sergey Bogoslovskiy of our staff:

[Begin recording] [Bogoslovskiy] So, Vladimir, now what is the purpose for your visit here?

[Bukovskiy] Well, as I have tried to explain in the press conference, the most important thing for me now is that the country, finally, is ready to fight for its freedom, democracy and future. As long as they were under illusions under spells of illusions, of all kinds of perestroykas and revival of socialism I had no place here, there was no function for me here. Now I came, and I can support morally, openly, [word indistinct] or whatever means I have those who are able to fight, those who are ready to build democracy and market economy in this country. Let it be miners who are on strike right now, and I fully support them. Let it be the republican governments and the national democratic movements in the republics, which are already forming their governments, their future states, I am entirely with them and support them. That includes the Russian Federation too. And as I have tried to explain during the presentation of the press conference, Boris Yeltsin at the moment is undisputed leader of Russians' Democratic Movement, and therefore I support him.

[Bogoslovskiy] What do you think about the recent situation in this country, and what do you see maybe some way out of this crisis?

[Bukovskiy] As I have already said, the only way to recover from this crisis, or to transmit it through that, let's say, is through the massive disobedience, the passive, the nonviolent methods of struggle including the all-union political strike. I believe that will be the best solution for us, as it happened in some countries of Eastern Europe and showed to be one of the best recipes—in Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia—and I think the time has come for us to go through that. Unless we do that and the old structures remain in power we would never have a chance of starting any reform. There is no sense in passing new laws, or reforms, or legislation if you don't have executive power to introduce them in reality, it's just a senseless activity. You have to get power in order to get done what you want to do. So that is the first task in my view, and that's what I am here to tell to every political figure, small and big.

[Bogoslovskiy] Vladimir, in a way you started the perestroyka in the sixties and in a way you are a prophet, so what are, in your mind, are the prospects for the future in this country?

[Bukovskiy] Well, I am not a prophet, I am an analyst. The difference is very significant. While prophets usually say that will happen analysts say that may happen, and analysts always suggest few scenarios, possible scenarios on the situation. So, since the record of prophets is rather bad, most of them are killed, I would rather be an analyst and I can offer you a scenario. One of them if this country has not got to get united and to demand a removal of the remnants of the communist regime then we will have a peaceful transition. If we don't have that, if the country is not ready to do that, as many seemed to

imply in the audience today, then we will have a rather appalling nightmarish scenario of food riots, strikes, repressions, mutinies, which is messy and bloody. The outcome will be the same anyway. But, as any good commander in the field, our obligation is to achieve the victory with as little blood as possible.

[Bogoslovskiy] Vladimir, and to what platform do you stand, and maybe what platform you support now in this recent political situation in this country?

[Bukovskiy] Well, I mean, there is not a specific platform. I spelled it out in the press conference very clearly. Number one, we would have to dissolve the union as quickly as possible and to allow the republics to develop their own statehood, and we would establish goodneighborly relations with them, including economic cooperation. Second, we would have to try to introduce market economy as radically as possible, far more radically than it is done in Poland for a very simple reason, the more grave disease you have the bigger dose of medicine you have to administer, and that's exactly the case. You would have to transit to a market economy almost by decree, almost within a couple of months, we don't have time for 500 days even.

[Bogoslovskiy] Thank you very much.

[Bukovskiy] Thank you. [end recording]

Attempts To Inculcate Historic 'Hatred'

LD1904223591 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 19 Apr 91

[By TASS political observer Sergey Kolesnikov]

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—It is never late to learn and it is always useful. It is also important, however, what to learn and who from. Quite unexpectedly, the problem of choosing the right advisers acquired a key importance in our tempestuous political life. Specialists in politics and economics of world renown, for example, Nobel Prize winner Vasiliy Leontieff or well-known Sovietologist Steven Cohen, stress with unfailing tactfulness their unwillingness to interfere in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs, while other specialists of far smaller calibre do not hesitate to shower the Soviet Union with instructions and admonitions.

Quite recently instructions were given to Russian legislators in the conference hall of the Soviet parliament by Vladimir Bukovskiy, previously a Soviet citizen and now a citizen of Britain.

We shall not go into detail concerning the developments, that took place 20 years ago. A just assessment of the repressive policy with regard to the dissident movement is well known. Perestroyka and glasnost made this issue perfectly clear. Courage and moral strength of many human rights champions are described in Bukovskiy's interesting memoirs. However, what is taking place these days has little to do with the moral ideals of the dissident movement.

The former human rights activist spoke about the same problems which are being tackled by some radical publications or mentioned by speakers at rallies. He said, for example, that it would be nice to get rid of the "vestiges of the Communist system" and the "Communist government" this spring. With this in view it is necessary to unite, to "call for a nationwide strike". If the "democrats" do not lead the strike, this will be done without their participation.

The guest from Britain made numerous recommendations on a general civil disobedience campaign and stressed its importance on the present stage, speaking at a press conference in the Demokraticheskaya Rossia publishing house.

Those who are actively working for the destabilisation of the situation in the country, the disintegration of the national economy and state institutions understood very well the meaning of Bukovskiy's appeals. Moreover, the most zealous of radicals with a new-Bolshevik mentality are already trying to put them into practice. In this case no attention is paid to differences between the "left-wing" and the "right-wing". Many forces are now trying to take under their control the strike movement and to gain political capital on the economic difficulties.

Bukovskiy is trying to inculcate in us the same hatred that was typical of many periods of our eventful history. The best representatives of Russian intellectuals protested against it and rejected totalitarianism and intolerance.

There is one more thing we should like to mention. Bukovskiy said that the British Government had exerted much effort, getting a Soviet visa for him. Thus, the authorities of the friendly state probably took upon themselves part of the responsibility for interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

Chelyabinsk Rally Supports Striking Miners

LD2104210591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] South Urals miners held a rally in Chelyabinsk today in support of the miners' strikes. Representatives of strike committees in Kopeysk, Korkino, and Yemanzhelinsk took part. Appeals for a strike continue even though there is already a shortfall of more than 300,000 tonnes of fuel and R18 million of profit in Chelyabinskugol Association. The social program in miners' towns is being cut.

Police Clash With Oil Pipeline Demonstrators

LD2204140591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Almetyevsk (Tatar SSR), 22 Apr (TASS)—A clash between demonstrators and police and subunits of the

internal troops occurred at the zero kilometer post of the Druzhba transcontinental oil pipeline.

It all began on Sunday [21 April]. A thousands-strong rally was held on the central square of Almetyevsk. The subject was Tatar sovereignty. Then the impassioned participants set off for the Druzhba oil pipeline under green banners of the prophet carrying slogans of "Tatar Oil for Tataria." Not far from the (?pumping) station they were met by policemen and internal troops. On the demand to halt, bottles and stones were thrown at them from the crowd. Two young people who broke through a metal fence got to the station and attempted to close the gates, which could have resulted in the destruction of the pipeline itself. The hooligans were ejected. The police were forced to use rubber truncheons.

'National-Patriots' Movement Described

LD1804200191 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 18 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandorova]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The movement of "National-Patriots" gaining strength in Russia claims the role of a "third", alternative political force during the confrontation between the ruling Soviet Communist Party and opposition from Democratic Russia.

The "Patriots" have taken a decisive step to rally their supporters when the coordination council of more than 40 Russian organisations "supporting National-Patriotism" was formed in February 1991.

The council's Chairman Eduard Volodin told TASS that the council includes people representing a wide political range of opinion—from Communists to monarchists.

Those who favour "the revival of Great Russia" decided to oppose the economic and political programmes of both "Communist leaders" and "pseudo-democrats". They believe that "both are oriented towards the West and do not take into account historic traditions".

The other day the coordination council issued an address to Russia's citizens. It demanded the resignation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and of his main opponent, chief of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin.

Various Russian movements of the nationalist trend have not been particularly popular until now. Most of their candidates were defeated at the election of Russian people's deputies last year. "Each of us acted separately, and so we lost the elections. Now we have forgotten our political differences and are on the way to unity," Volodin said.

The "Patriots'" programme for Russia's economic stabilisation actually envisages the restoration of the past: the return to centralised economic management and achievement of the level of productivity that existed in 1985, when Gorbachev launched perestroyka.

They believe that this process will take quite a few years and then it will be possible to consider the transition to a market.

Volodin said that if this transition is attempted immediately, "this will be the road to chaos and civil war."

They also spoke out against the hasty setting up of farmers' economies and say that "elimination of collective farms at the present stage will lead to famine in Russia."

Recognising the need for economic cooperation with the West "National-Patriots" believe that "a system shaping now will enable Western capital to rob Russia."

The "National-Patriots'" political programme is much more amorphous than its economic programme. They suggest that all parties be disbanded for the period of economic stabilisation and that "a slow, calm and cautious liberalisation of the regime" be embarked upon in a few years' time.

Who will begin the programme of the revival of "Great Russia"? This will be done by "good" politicians and a "national government" which will replace the choice between Gorbachev and Yeltsin.

Volodin denies that a political party is being formed. "We are not striving for power," he said again and again. However, one gets the impression that the party is already being formed.

"The restorers of the past" will try out their strength during the preparation for the election of a Russian president planned for June 12. The "Patriotic Movement" intends to participate in it actively. But Volodin said that it has not yet been decided if it will nominate its own presidential candidate.

Draft Law on Status of Moscow

91UN1339A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Apr 91 p 4

[Draft USSR Law on the Status of the Capital of the USSR and RSFSR]

[Text] Based on the Union Treaty and the USSR Constitution, and proceeding from the provisions of the RSFSR Federative Treaty and RSFSR Constitution, this law defines the basic principles of the legal status, economic base, and organization of the government and administration of the capital of the USSR and RSFSR.

The law is aimed at ensuring the conditions for the work of union bodies of authority and administration provided for by the Union Treaty and USSR Constitution, as well as of the offices of the sovereign republics, foreign states, and international organizations, and for the performance of other functions of the capital in accordance with the powers of the USSR.

The procedures for exercising the functions of the RSFSR capital are defined by RSFSR laws.

Section I. The Capital District

Article 1. The Capital of the USSR

The capital of the USSR is the city of Moscow.

The capital of the USSR is the location of union bodies of authority and administration and of the residence of the head of the union state—the president of the USSR.

The capital-city functions assigned to the city of Moscow may not limit the rights of USSR citizens living in it, or likewise, establish any sort of privileges for them.

Article 2. The Capital District as a Special Territorial Formation.

In accordance with the Union Treaty (appendix on the capital of the USSR), the city of Moscow constitutes a special territorial entity—the capital district, to which, while preserving the powers of the RSFSR, and within limits defined by this law, the jurisdiction of the USSR extends.

The capital district includes the territories necessary for the exercise of the powers of union bodies of authority and administration, and of the offices of the sovereign republics, foreign states and international organizations.

Changes in the boundaries of the capital district are made by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet with the consent of the Federation Council and on the recommendation of the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies and the Moscow Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Article 3. The Powers of the USSR in Matters Involving the Administration of the Capital District

The jurisdiction of the USSR in the person of its bodies of authority and administration on the territory of the capital district includes:

a) the establishment of procedures for administration of the territories under the jurisdiction of union bodies of authority and administration, and of the offices of the sovereign republics;

b) the formation of a list of items of property essential for the exercise of the powers of union bodies of authority and government;

c) the establishment of procedures to provide for the activities of union bodies of authority and administration, and of the offices of the sovereign republics, and also for their relations with the capital district's bodies of authority and administration;

d) the confirmation of union state programs for the district's development, and of expenditures for the exercise of capital-city functions;

e) the coordination and oversight of the activities of state agencies for maintaining public order and combating crime;

f) the determination of the capital district's representation on union bodies of authority and administration;

g) the establishment of procedures to provide for the activities of the offices of foreign states and international organizations, and for their relations with the capital district's bodies of authority and administration, in accordance with the laws and international agreements of the USSR;

h) the resolution, in accordance with the powers and agreements of the USSR, of other questions pertaining to the exercise of the functions of the union capital.

Article 4. The Powers of the USSR and RSFSR in Matters Pertaining to the Administration of the Capital District

The joint jurisdiction of the USSR and RSFSR in the person of their bodies of authority and administration on the territory of the capital district includes:

a) the establishment of the procedures for the territorial-administrative structure, organization, and activities of bodies of authority and administration;

b) the implementation of a coordinated policy for the capital city's development, and the formation of territorial complexes necessary for exercise of the powers of bodies of authority and administration of the USSR and RSFSR, and of the offices of republics and foreign states;

c) the delimitation of union property and the property of the RSFSR and other republics; the implementation of a uniform financial, credit, tax and price policy;

d) the establishment of procedures for the participation of the district's bodies of authority and administration in foreign-economic ties;

e) the regulation of matters of environmental safety and the maintenance of public order;

f) the establishment of lists and of the protected status of historical cultural and architectural territories and complexes, and the adoption of measures for their protection and use;

g) concern for the position of the city of Moscow as the traditional religious and spiritual center of the RSFSR and USSR, and for religious organizations' exercise of their rights in accordance with laws of the USSR, the RSFSR and other republics;

h) the determination of procedures for Moscow Oblast's participation in the exercise of the functions of the capital of the USSR and RSFSR;

i) the resolution according to procedures established by law of questions pertaining to the dissolution of the city soviet of people's deputies and removal of the city mayor.

Article 5. Agreements of the USSR and the RSFSR on Matters Pertaining to Administration of the Capital District

The joint powers of the USSR and RSFSR on matters pertaining to administration of the capital district are exercised on the basis of agreements between the USSR and RSFSR.

The USSR in the person of the USSR president, taking the opinion of the Federation Council into account, may turn over to the RSFSR the exercise of certain of its

powers in matters pertaining to the administration of the capital district, and the RSFSR, through the conclusion of an agreement with the USSR, may additionally delegate to it the exercise of certain of its powers in matters pertaining to the administration of the capital district.

The preparation and adoption of decisions of union bodies of authority and administration on matters pertaining to the capital district are done with due regard for the opinion of corresponding RSFSR bodies of authority and administration.

Disputes over the exercise of USSR powers or exercise of rights and performance of duties in the area of the joint powers of the USSR and RSFSR in matters pertaining to the administration of the capital district are resolved by means of conciliation procedures. If agreement fails to be reached, disputes are submitted for consideration, as appropriate, by the USSR Constitutional Court, the USSR Supreme Court, or the USSR Higher Court of Arbitration.

Article 6. Relations Between the Capital District and Other Sovereign Republics

Relations between the capital district and the sovereign republics are based on the Union Treaty and the USSR constitution and laws.

The capital district's bodies of authority and administration provide the conditions for representation of the sovereign republics' interests in the USSR capital.

The sovereign republics take part in offsetting the expenditures for performance of the functions of the union capital.

Article 7. Relations Between the Capital District and Moscow Oblast

Moscow Oblast takes part in performing the capital's functions and receives compensation for its expenditures for performing those functions out of the capital district's budget.

Article 8. Legislation in the Capital District

Legislation in the capital district consists of this law RSFSR legislation on the status of the RSFSR capital, and other USSR and RSFSR laws.

Apart from questions pertaining to its performance of the functions of capital, the city of Moscow, as a primary territorial level of local government, comes under the laws on soviets of people's deputies, local government and the local economy, if they are not in conflict with this law and RSFSR legislation on the status of the RSFSR capital.

Section II: The Bases of the Organization of Power and Administration of the Capital District.

Article 9. The City Soviet of People's Deputies

The capital district's body of authority and government is the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies.

The city soviet's rights and duties are defined by this law, RSFSR legislation on the status of the RSFSR capital, and other USSR and RSFSR laws.

The city soviet's jurisdiction in performing the functions of union capital includes:

a) the submission to union bodies of authority and government of draft state programs for development of the capital district (including the formation of territorial complexes);

b) the presentation to the USSR Supreme Soviet of proposals for the approval of expenditures for the performance of the functions of the union capital;

c) the resolution of questions pertaining to the district's territorial-administrative structure (with the exception of territories under the jurisdiction of union bodies of authority and administration);

d) exercise of the right of legislative initiative in the USSR Supreme Soviet in matters pertaining to the capital district;

e) the suspension of acts of the director of the City Administration, as well as revocation of the decisions of the territorial-administrative units' bodies of authority and administration, in the event that they are in conflict with USSR laws, ukases of the USSR president, or decrees of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers;

f) the implementation of policy in the area of preservation and development of the cultural and historical legacy; the adoption of regulations on the city's historic center;

g) the development of citywide policy for ensuring a quality of the city environment and of all types of services appropriate to the capital;

h) the regulation of employment and the use of labor resources.

Normative and other acts of the city soviet must not conflict with USSR laws, decrees of the USSR president, or decrees of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, or damage the USSR's state interests.

Article 10. Mayor of the City/Capital District

The state official possessing, within the limits established by law, supreme executive authority in the capital district is the city mayor.

The city mayor is elected by secret ballot by USSR citizens residing permanently in the capital district on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage for a term of five years and may be recalled or removed according to procedures established by law.

Variant:

(The city mayor is elected by the city soviet on recommendation by the USSR president and with the consent of the supreme state official of the RSFSR.)

In performing the functions pertaining to the union capital, the mayor of the city/capital district:

a) ensures the execution of USSR laws, ukases of the USSR president, and decrees of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers;

b) takes necessary measures for the exercise, by the city soviet, the bodies and services of city administration and government, enterprises, institutions and organizations of their powers related to performance of the functions of the capital;

c) ensures the protection of state and public order and of citizens' rights and liberties within the district's territory, and gives permission, according to established procedures, for the holding of rallies, street marches and demonstrations;

d) represents the USSR capital within the country and in international relations;

e) provides for cooperation between the district's bodies of executive authority and the city soviet;

f) presents annual reports on the state of the district to the city soviet;

g) forms the City Administration, and presents candidates for director of the City Administration for confirmation by the city soviet;

h) convenes sessions of the city soviet and signs its decisions; has the right, within no later than a week's time, to return a decision with his objections to the soviet for repeat discussion and voting. If the city soviet, by a two-thirds majority, confirms a decision that it has previously adopted, the mayor signs it;

i) raises before the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, according to procedures established by law, the question of dissolving the city soviet in the event of its failure to execute laws of the USSR or RSFSR, or ukases of the USSR president, and of scheduling new elections;

j) has the right to chair meetings of the city Administrative Council, revoke decisions of the director of the City Administration, and suspend the execution of the acts of USSR ministries and departments in the event that they violate established procedures for relations with the capital district's bodies of authority and administration;

k) carries out instructions of the USSR president on matters pertaining to the performance of the capital's functions.

On the basis of and by way of executing USSR laws, RSFSR laws, ukases of the USSR president, acts of the RSFSR's supreme state official, and decrees of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and RSFSR Council of Ministers, the city mayor promulgates decrees having binding force within the capital district's territory.

The city mayor may be removed by the USSR president in the event of his failure to execute the USSR Law on the Status of the Capital of the USSR and RSFSR, other laws of the USSR and RSFSR, or ukases of the USSR president. An ukase of the USSR president on removal of the city mayor is adopted with the consent of the RSFSR's supreme state official.

If the major of the city/capital district cannot, for any reason, continue to perform his duties, until the election of a new city mayor his powers are transferred to the director of the City Administration. In this case, elections of a new city major must be held within two months.

Article 11. The City Administration

In order to manage the city economy and municipally owned facilities, implement programs of economic and social development, draw up and fulfill the city budget, and ensure environmental protection, protection of the public order and citizens' rights and liberties, the development of local government, and oversight of the observance of legislation by the agencies and services of city administration and government, and by enterprises, institutions and organizations, a City Administration is formed.

Procedures for relations between administrative bodies and services belonging to the City Administration and union administrative bodies in matters pertaining to the performance of the functions of capital are defined by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

Within the limits of his authority, the director of the City Administration issues orders that are binding on the executives of city administrative agencies and services and of enterprises, institutions and organizations located within the capital district's territory. Orders of the director of the City Administration may be revoked by the city mayor or the city soviet.

In order to coordinate the activities of city administrative agencies and services, an Administrative Council is established consisting of the director of the City Administration/chairman of the city soviet and city counsellors. Appointments to city counsellor are determined by the city mayor on the basis of a representation by the director of the City Administration. The supreme officials of the territorial administrative units are ex officio members of the Administrative Council.

The director of the City Administration may be removed by a decree of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers with the consent of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and the city soviet in the event of his violation of the USSR Law on the Status of the Capital of the USSR and RSFSR, other laws of the USSR and RSFSR, ukases of the USSR president, acts of the RSFSR's supreme state official, or decrees of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers or RSFSR Council of Ministers. The director of the City Administration may also be removed by decision of the city mayor with the consent of the city soviet.

The city soviet may express no-confidence in the director of the City Administration, which results in his resignation. Decisions on these matters are taken by a majority of at least two-thirds of the total number of deputies to the city soviet.

Article 12. Relations Between the Capital District's Bodies of Authority and Administration and Union Bodies of Authority and Administration

The representation of the capital district on union bodies of authority and administration is determined by the USSR Constitution and USSR laws.

In matters pertaining to performance of the functions of capital, union bodies of authority and administration exercise direct oversight of the capital district's corresponding bodies of authority and administration.

In matters pertaining to their performance of the functions of capital, the district's bodies of authority and administration communicate directly with corresponding union bodies of authority and administration.

From among USSR people's deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet elects a USSR Committee on Affairs of the Capital District in order to do law-drafting work and to prepare annual findings concerning the amounts of the capital's functions, drafts of the district's budget and the report on its fulfillment, oversight of the performance of state bodies and organizations, and other matters pertaining to the capital district and falling within the jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

With the consent of the corresponding body of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the Committee on the Affairs of the Capital District may work with it as a combined committee.

The city soviet and city mayor submit proposals to union bodies of authority and administration on matters pertaining to the capital district's development.

The mayor of the city/capital district has the right to take part in meetings of the Federation Council.

The executives of agencies of the USSR Procuracy, USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and USSR State Security Committee operating within the capital district's territory are appointed and removed from their offices by appropriate USSR agencies with the consent of the USSR president and the RSFSR supreme state official.

Variant:

(The executives of agencies of the USSR Procuracy, USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and USSR State Security Committee operating within the capital district's territory are appointed and removed from their offices by joint decisions of the appropriate state agencies of the USSR and RSFSR—with the consent of the USSR president and the RSFSR supreme state official.)

In the event that they violate USSR legislation on the capital district, decisions of the city soviet and city mayor may be revoked by the USSR Supreme Soviet, and decrees of the city mayor may also be revoked by the USSR president.

In matters not regulated by USSR laws, ukases of the USSR president and decrees of the USSR cabinet of ministers, union bodies of authority and administration and the capital district's bodies of authority and administration may render each other mutual services by agreement.

Section III. Economic Guarantees of the Performance of the Functions of the Capital

Article 13. The Principles of Economic Relations in the Capital District

The district's bodies of authority and administration provide union bodies of authority and administration, and the offices of the sovereign republics, foreign states and international organizations with plots of land, buildings and installations, housing and municipal and other services necessary for their exercise of their powers; provide conditions for the holding of state union and international activities; and take the performance of the functions of the capital into account in developing the city's general plan.

Union bodies of authority and administration reimburse the outlays of the capital district's bodies of authority and administration for the use of plots of land, buildings and installations, housing and municipal and other services; and they provide subventions and also allocate material resources for union programs connected with the performance of the functions of the capital and ensuring of the appropriate quality of the city environment and living conditions for the population.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers takes part in the resolution of questions pertaining to material and technical supplies for the capital district.

Article 14. Property in the Capital District

Within the district's territory the city soviet exercises rights of ownership with respect to property classified by USSR and RSFSR laws as municipal property, and also handles the control, use and disposal of land and natural resources in accordance with USSR and RSFSR legislation.

Property, buildings, installations and other facilities that support, as of the moment this law takes effect, the functioning of USSR bodies of authority and administration are (except for those that are leased) union property. Plots of land on which the aforementioned facilities are located are under the control of union bodies of authority and administration on the basis of the rights of control and use and may be withdrawn with the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Plots of land on which facilities of the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR State Security Committee, the USSR internal and railroad troops are located are controlled and used free of charge by appropriate union bodies of authority and administration and may be withdrawn with the consent of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

The revision of the rights of land use, and the placement of new plots of land under the control of the bodies of authority and administration of the USSR and sovereign

republics are carried out with the consent of the capital district's bodies of authority and administration.

The city soviet may establish charges for land and municipally owned facilities that are differentiated among the capital district's territories on the basis of normative rates set by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Article 15. The Capital District's Financial Resources

The capital district's financial resources consist of budget and nonbudget moneys. The sources of the district's budget revenues are receipts established by USSR and RSFSR laws for the formation of local budgets, receipts from the union budget for performance of the functions of the union capital, and receipts from the RSFSR budget for performance of the functions of republic capital, including foreign-exchange deductions.

The city soviet has the right to establish additional payments and levies with the permission of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers or RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Article 16. The Capital District's Participation in Foreign-Economic Ties

The capital district's administrative agencies have the right to issue licenses for the export of goods produced within the district's territory and the import of output, if that licensing is not carried out by union or republic administrative agencies.

Section IV. Regulations for the Transitional Period

Article 17. The Transitional Period

The regulations of this section are in effect for the period up until the Union Treaty and RSFSR Federal Treaty are concluded and take effect, a new city soviet is elected, and the capital district's bodies of authority and administration stipulated in this law are formed.

If the norms established in the section's articles are in conflict with the norms of other articles of this law, the regulations for the transitional period apply.

Article 18. Provisional Agreement on Delimiting the Powers of the USSR and the RSFSR on Matters Pertaining to the Administration of the Capital District

Until the Union Treaty and RSFSR Federal Treaty take effect, the powers of the USSR and RSFSR on matters pertaining to administration of the capital district are delimited in accordance with a provisional agreement concluded by authorized representatives of the USSR and RSFSR and ratified by the Federation Council.

Article 19. On the City Soviet of People's Deputies

For the transitional period, the capital district's body of authority and administration is the current city soviet, which exercises the powers stipulated by the USSR Law on the Status of the Capital of the USSR and RSFSR, and other USSR and RSFSR laws.

Variant:

(For the transitional period a Standing Committee of the City Soviet of People's Deputies is formed.)

The Standing Committee is elected from among the deputies to the city soviet.

Upon expiration of the city soviet's term, its Standing Committee retains its powers until the election of a new city soviet.

In the period between sessions of the city soviet, the Standing Committee resolves all matters assigned by this law to its jurisdiction, with the exception of the powers established in Article 9, points (c), (d) and (g); convenes soviet sessions at least twice a year; and resolves other questions assigned by USSR and RSFSR legislation to the jurisdiction of the presidium of the city soviet.

Decisions taken by the Standing Committee are signed by the city mayor.

Article 20. On the Mayor of the City/Capital District

The city mayor is elected by secret ballot by USSR citizens permanently residing in the capital district on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage for a term of five years and may be removed according to procedures established by law.

Variant:

("The city soviet nominates candidates for the post of city mayor and convenes for the purposes of his election an Assembly of the people's deputies of the Moscow City Soviet and the city's rayon soviets. A candidate is considered elected who has received, in secret balloting, a majority of the votes, given a quorum of at least two-thirds of the Assembly of the capital district's people's deputies.

"The decision on election of the mayor of the city/capital district is submitted for approval by the Federation Council.")

From the moment of their election (confirmation), and within the limits of their powers, the city mayor and director of the City Administration resolve questions assigned by USSR and RSFSR legislation to the jurisdiction of the city soviet executive committee, and the city mayor also resolves questions assigned to the jurisdiction of the chairman of the city soviet.

The city soviet takes part in the adoption of decisions on the privatization of state property within the capital district's territory.

Criticisms and proposals are to be sent to the following address: 103009, Moscow, Kalinin Prospect, 4/22, Commission for Drafting the USSR Law on the Status of the Capital of the USSR and RSFSR.

Western Republics

Minsk Strike Committee Convenes Workers Rally

LD2304094691 Moscow TASS in English 0929 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By BELTA-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Minsk April 23—Leaders of the Minsk strike committee fulfilled their promise to convene a rally unless all political and economic demands of the strikers are met.

Columns of workers were streaming to the Lenin Square from Minsk enterprises since morning. According to unverified data, some 30 Minsk enterprises sent their representatives to the rally.

At the Kirov machine-tool plant, BELTA correspondent was told that in order not to halt production, one worker from every hundred was sent for the rally. It was suggested that other strike committees send workers to the rally in the same proportion.

There are reports that work collectives in some other Belorussian cities support workers in Minsk. It will be clear in the hours ahead if the rally develops into a republican political strike, of which leaders of the Minsk strike committee warned yesterday.

20,000 Workers Demonstrate

AU2304093491 Paris AFP in English 0917 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, April 23 (AFP)—Thousands of demonstrators Tuesday rallied in Lenin Square, in the centre of Minsk, the Belorussian capital, at the start of a republic-wide day of strikes against Communist Party rule.

From 20,000 to 30,000 demonstrators streamed into the square at the start of the rally, following the failure of efforts on Monday by the strike committees and the local government to reach agreement on the workers' political demands, Oleg Trizno, the Council of Ministers' press spokesman said by telephone.

Broad agreement was reached on the strikers' economic demands—including large-scale pay increases and a reduction in business taxes to allow factories to spend more on cantine food—but negotiations on political demands were deadlocked, Mr. Trizno said.

Strikers' demands included the nationalisation of Communist Party property, an end to direct party influence over government bodies and the "abolition of communist cadres privileges", Mr. Trizno said.

Some strikers have called for staggered stoppages throughout the republic until the local parliament meets to examine their demands. Parliament is next due to meet on May 21.

A spokesman for the Minsk strike committee said however that factory representatives would decide at Tuesday's rally in Minsk how long to continue the stoppage. Workers had also come out on strike in the towns of Vitebsk, Brest, Soligorsk and Borisov in the republic, he added.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of miners remained on strike throughout the Soviet Union Tuesday, paralyzing up to a third of production and causing havoc in coal-operated industries. [passage omitted]

Belorussian Legislature Urges 'Self-Control'

LD2204190191 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0300 GMT 21 Apr 91

["Address of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian Republic and the Council of Ministers to the Belorussian People"]

[Text] Dear compatriots! The April events have stirred the republic. Pain and anxiety for the future of the entire Belorussian people grow in everyone's heart. In this most difficult situation, the bodies of government and leadership are doing everything possible to solve the questions of social protection of the population. At a time of a considerable drop in the country's production, the tendency toward economic stabilization in the republic has increased. Considerable additional measures for social protection of the population in connection with the retail price reform have been taken. Questions of great importance for the economy and political life of the republic have been suggested to be included in the agenda of the fourth session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, which will take place on 21 May. The activity of the bodies of power, which were selected by the people, is taking place in conditions of full openness, and they try to solve and do solve problems without applying methods of force.

But all this, as events of recent days show, does not satisfy those who tried but failed to reach power through a lawful and democratic way. More and more new political demands come from the mouths of leaders newly brought to light.

Every intelligent person understands that all the most important questions, including the questions of denationalization, privatization, private ownership of land and departyization, should be solved in a constitutional way, on the basis of adopted laws, by way of referendum and moral code. The other way leads to further deepening of the crisis and worsening of living conditions of people, and puts the republic's economy in a hopeless position.

At this dangerous time one should take a well-judged approach to the events which are taking place, and look objectively at who is doing things. We must altogether stop destructive processes that lead to chaos and catastrophe. We appeal to all citizens of the republic to show self-control and good sense and not to yield to calls for strikes.

TASS Report on Internal Troops in Minsk Refuted

PM1904162391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Union Edition p 8

[Letter from N. Mazay, deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers: "Inaccuracy Committed"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA issue No. 87, in a postscript to the article "Minsk Strike Committee Puts Forward Demands" by Comrade M. Shimanskiy, IZVESTIYA correspondent in the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], carried a report by a TASS correspondent that truckloads of internal troops appeared in the Minsk streets adjoining the central square on the morning of 11 April 1991.

The Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers refutes the information given by TASS, and reports that the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet and the republic government did not give any instructions to bring in internal troops on any of the days of the strike, and that no other similar actions were taken.

Belorussia Abolishes Food Sales Tax

LD2204201191 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0300 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] The Belorussian Republic Council of Ministers has ordered the abolition of the sales tax on a number of foodstuffs. From 23 April, contract prices are banned on fruit and vegetable juices and drinks produced and sold in the republic. The relevant departments have received instructions to carry out re-pricing of juices and drinks and to insure their uninterrupted sale. New wholesale prices will also be set for them. Medical and sanitary establishments for children, public catering enterprises, and cafeterias will be the first units supplied with juices and drinks.

The list of food from which the sales tax has been removed includes confectionary, fish products, and tinned fish—excluding delicacies—oil, margarine products and mayonaise, tea, and concentrated products of coffee. The tax is being removed from sales of beer, non-alcoholic drinks, concentrated fruit, home and imported citrus plants, as well as potatoes and vegetables which are sold at both the list price and contractual prices.

Ukraine Trade Union-Government Talks Discussed

LD2204164191 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 20 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Talks between the republican government and the Council of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Ukraine [CFITUU] are continuing. They are concentrating on price increases. Correspondent Valentin Sidorenko has met with CFITUU Chairman Anatoliy Kovalevskiy:

[Begin Kovalevskiy recording] The content and aim of the talks are to conclude an agreement with the government to provide the workers at this difficult time with specific economic and social guarantees. The talks have, of course, been influenced by the price reform. In our view, the compensation is insufficient compared with the losses suffered by the population from this measure. That is why our trade unions demand that the wage reform be brought considerably closer to the price reform. [passage omitted] In principle the government agrees with implementing the wage reform. We disagree with the government on the time span for realizing this reform. The government insists that it be done in 1992, we say as early as this year.

As for the strikes, they have always been a great weapon in the hands of the working people, and we will not reject them. However, in the prevailing situation, when we are holding talks with the government, there should be a moratorium. You know yourself, when talks are in progress all military activities are discontinued. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Hungarian Delegation Consults Ukrainians

AU1904102391 Budapest MTI in English 1947 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 17 April (MTI)—The delegation of the Hungarian Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee held talks with representatives of the Ukrainian Parliament and the Foreign Ministry in Kiev on Wednesday. The negotiations were marked by a particularly favourable atmosphere. The Ukrainian side welcomed the Hungarian proposal for opening a new border-crossing point at Beregsurany.

Miklos Vasarhelyi of the Alliance of Free Democrats told an MTI correspondent that both sides expressed their firm preparedness to develop Hungaro-Ukrainian relations, and raised the idea of opening a Hungarian consulate in Uzhgorod, and a Soviet consulate in Debrecen.

The delegation held talks with Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoly Zlenko on the prospects of bilateral relations.

In the subsequent consultation with members of the Ukrainian Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee, the sides held identical views on the need for developing bilateral relations in an intensive way.

The talks with Leonid Kravchuk, president of the Ukrainian Parliament, went on in a constructive fashion. Both Kravchuk and Zlenko stressed that the Ukrainian foreign policy, gaining more autonomy, gave priority to the establishment of political and economic relations with Hungary.

Gyula Horn, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, underlined the importance of the declaration to be signed with the Ukraine on the protection and role of

national minorities. Horn stressed that Hungary sought to maintain good relations with both the Soviet Union as a federal state, and its member republics.

Gyorgy Csoti, deputy chairman of the committee, said Hungary would welcome the participation of the Ukraine in the 1995 World Expo, and would be glad to host Ukrainian believers on the occasion of the Papal visit next August.

CPSU Activity Banned at Donetsk Pit

PM2204143391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "From Donetsk: Working Virtually in Underground Conditions"]

[Text] Seven mines in the Donbass have declared CPSU committees persona non grata. Last fall the director of the "Kirovskaya" mine signed an order refusing the party committee the lease of premises and banning political activity on the enterprise's territory. This was on the administration's orders and not at the collective's demand. The same order—which the prosecutor's office has protested, incidentally—bans Communists from holding meetings and putting up posters, pamphlets, or even declarations. However, the appearance at the mine of pamphlets published by various democratic and nationalist organizations does not arouse this kind of response from the administration.

According to V. Naumov, mine party committee secretary, the party committee is now leasing premises from the residential district's sociopolitical center. However, it is already clear that it will not be able to pay the bills for very long. It will have to allow in a missionary organization and they will fight together for people's souls. Although each in their own way, of course.

News Conference on Problems With Chernobyl Laws

LD1904232191 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 19 Apr 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petruniya]

[Text] Kiev April 20 TASS—About five billion roubles will be needed for the implementation of a package of laws dealing with the elimination of consequences of the Chernobyl accident, which were adopted by the Ukrainian parliament in February. This was stated at a press conference, held in Kiev on Friday. It was attended by chairman of the Ukrainian Committee for Protecting Population Against Chernobyl After-Effects Georgiy Gotovchits, Chairman of the Ukrainian Federation of Independent Trade Unions Anatoliy Kovalevskiy, Ukrainian Health Minister Yuriy Spizhenko, representatives of republican ministries and institutions.

It was stated at the press conference that there are two main problems connected with the implementation of the Chernobyl laws. First, it is necessary to ensure their implementation in the whole of the republic and in similar ways. About two million people were directly affected by the Chernobyl catastrophe in the Ukraine alone.

The second problem is connected with the fact that there is no federal law on the status of Chernobyl victims, their rights and privileges. At the same time, the privileges envisaged by the Ukrainian laws cannot be spread to the participants in the clean-up operation, who live outside the republic. The privileges include rather important ones: Chernobyl victims are exempt from all kinds of taxes. Their retirement age is 10 years less than the officially established level. They can use municipal and other transport without paying for it. These are just a few of the privileges.

Republican health minister expressed doubt in a possibility to put the laws into practice in full volume, because there is no financial basis for it. The implementation of the medical part of the programme alone will require 2.5 billion roubles. Responding to questions of journalists, he said that, according to his information, 600 people, who had taken part in the Chernobyl clean-up operation, had died during the past five years. Infant mortality rate remains on the same level as before the accident.

'Bells of Chernobyl' Media Event To Begin 25 Apr

LD2004011791 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 19 Apr 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petruniya]

[Text] Kiev April 19 TASS—"The purpose of the 'Bells of Chernobyl' teleradiothon, which will be held from 19.30 on April 25 to 24.00 on April 26, is to draw public attention to current Chernobyl problems and collect money to solve the most pressing ones," journalists were told at a press conference here.

Chairman of the Ukrainian State Television and Radio Committee Nikolay Okhmakevich noted that the television part of the marathon will be transmitted right from the Oktyabrsky Palace of Culture in Kiev. Invited to take part in it are both victims of the Chernobyl disaster and people who have contributed to the Chernobyl relief fund. Some 100 topics have been prepared, featuring heroes who helped clean up the disaster consequences, people who have been living in conditions of radioactive pollution for quite a time now and sick children badly in need of medical assistance.

The telethon will be joined by TV studios in eight regions of the Ukraine and also in Minsk (Belorussia) and Bryansk (Russia), as well as by some foreign TV corporations.

U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, UNESCO General Director Federico Mayor, American Doctor

Robert Gale, who treated Chernobyl victims, and prominent leaders of the Ukrainian diaspora will participate in the foreign part of the telethon.

A radiothon will also be transmitted live.

Okhmakevich said that the money collected during the teleradiothon would be distributed by the coordination commission of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, which includes representatives of state and public organisations, as well as people's deputies. It will be used to treat children and to set up a republican leukemia and acute leukosis treatment centre.

Program To Mark Chernobyl Anniversary in Ukraine

LD1804210191 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] The organizational committee for preparing measures in connection with the fifth anniversary of the breakdown at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station met in Kiev today. It was chaired by Masol, chairman of the committee and first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers.

The committee discussed the course of preparing measures for marking the anniversary. They will be held in the week from 22 to 29 May [as heard]. The program will include a commemorative meeting in the "Ukraina" Palace, an international conference, roundtable discussions, a news conference, and musical concerts.

It was stressed that everything should be done to prevent this event from becoming a pretext for escalating political passions and confrontations. Instead, it should foster the consolidation of society for overcoming the consequences of the catastrophe and preventing it from happening again.

Caucasus

Continuing Reportage on South Ossetia Situation

'Intensive Gunfire' Reported

AU2204111091 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0200 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] The press center of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs has informed us that the situation in Tskhinvali and its neighboring villages is again tense. Last night, there was intensive gunfire in the town and one Georgian house was burned down. Tskhinvali is full of units of internal troops but, as one can see, either they cannot cope or they are not making any particular effort to protect the local population.

Yesterday morning, in the town center near the people's court, Ossetian extremists in a GAZ-53 automobile without license plates attacked four Georgians who were coming from the village of K'urt'a; they captured Zura Bachishvili and pursued Dat'o Bachishvili who was also captured. However, following the efforts of Tskhinvali's commandant, militia Colonel Shak'ro Dzintskaladze, the latter was soon released. Only two, Zura [name indistinct] and Goch'a Kakhniashvili, managed to escape.

Also yesterday, it was announced on the television program "Vremya" that apparently, the previous night, Georgian militants had attacked a village in the Tskhinvali Rayon and had killed three people. Militia Colonel Vano Nazridzisi, the chief of the provisional headquarters of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs, informed us, in connection with this fact, that this was the latest piece of false information broadcast by Vremya. There had been no attack on the Ossetian village let alone any killings.

Yesterday, residents of Georgian villages were being transported from the entrance to Tskhinvali in two automobiles under a military escort.

MVD Troops Help 'Extremists'

AU2204160891 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] We will begin with information on the situation in Samachablo [South Ossetia]. Every day, we receive confirmation of facts of collaboration between the USSR Internal Troops and Ossetian separatist extremists. On 21 April, in the village of Avnevi, in (?Znauri) Rayon, servicemen riding in an armored personnel carrier, which accompanied [words indistinct], detained, without any warrant, three more Georgians: Dzhemal Maraneli, Levan Kabanadze, and Levi [name indistinct], residents of that village. On 22 April, at night, the Ossetian bandits robbed and ransacked the homes of Azhor and Spartak (?Metutashvili) in the village of [name indistinct] in Tskhinvali Rayon, despite the fact that posts of the internal troops are located a few dozen meters away from that place. On Sunday, in the village of (?Suisi) in Tskhinvali Rayon, a ceremony took place marking the 40th day after Merab Mindiashvili had been brutally murdered and burned by the Ossetian bandits. Soldiers of the internal troops arrived there in helicopters and armored personnel carriers. They began to search the people who were in mourning. They confiscated authorized weapons from two workers of the rayon department of the Tskhinvali militia.

MVD Troops Complicate Situation

AU2304105791 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0200 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Letter from Georgian Internal Affairs Minister Khabuliani to USSR Internal Affairs Minister Pugo—date not given]

[Text] Mr. Dilar Khabuliani, the Republic of Georgia Minister of Internal Affairs, has sent a letter to Boris Pugo, USSR Minister of Internal Affairs.

The letter contains an appropriate evaluation of the introduction of Internal Troops to the territory of the former South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. It mentions unlawful acts committed by Internal Troops and particularly emphasizes the fact that with the support of the interior troops, Ossetian extremists and separatists are becoming even more active and there are new victims.

Other unlawful acts are being committed with the support of the Internal Troops, in particular [the formation of] the so-called National Salvation Committee and the appointment of compromised persons to the posts of procurator and militia chief in Tskhinvali at a time when Tskhinvali Rayon has a procurator and a militia chief.

The commanders of the Internal Troops are doing everything they can to prevent the Georgian Militia from implementing the law. Naturally, all this is further complicating the sociopolitical situation in the Republic of Georgia.

Mr. Dilar Khabuliani categorically demands that the commanders of the contingent of interior troops establish the necessary contacts with the commander appointed by the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs, and together with him implement measures in order to normalize the situation.

Strikes Gain Momentum in Georgia's Second City

AU2204110591 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0200 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Excerpt] The national strike that was called to press for the removal of USSR Armed Forces from Georgia is gaining momentum in Kutaisi. At a joint meeting of the prefecture and sakrebulo [organ of local government] a coordinating strike council has been formed under the leadership of the town's prefect, Mr. Archil Kostava.

Factories producing metal, eletrical engineering, and rubber goods that are of particular importance to the so-called centralized economy are now only working in order to supply goods that have been locally earmarked. They are fulfilling orders for Armenia and Azerbaijan but cooperation with all other enterprises in the Soviet Union has been completely halted.

Kutaisi's electrical engineering workers have halted the supply of [word indistinct] electric motors, [word indistinct] and electric locomotives to Union petroleum (?plants) and a whole range of economic installations. This amounts to daily output worth approximately 250,000 rubles but the financial losses incurred by the center are considerably greater.

By halting the supply of ball bearings and [word indistinct], the [word indistinct] rubber plant will considerably hinder industrial enterprises in Moscow, Kuybyshev, Vologda, and Saratov. Workers in Kutaisi's rubber plant are also no longer supplying [words indistinct] spare parts to some 150 depots in the state agro-industrial complex and this cannot fail to have a (?negative) influence on the gigantic empire's very (?weak) economy.

An electric machine collective at a factory subordinated to the Union in Gurchaani has gone on strike and sent a letter of protest to Mikhail Gorbachev. It is stated in the letter that the factory which supplies several cities in the Soviet Union with electric motors will not resume work until units of the Soviet Army have left Samachablo [South Ossetia]. [passage omitted]

Blockade by Georgia Seen Hurting Georgia

PM2204141791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

["Georgia: Political Situation" Article by Major P. Yakovlichenko: Blockade... of Common Sense"]

[Text] "A la guerre, comme a la guerre...." [i.e in war, one must take the rough with the smooth]—these words, uttered by Z. Gamsakhurdia at a press conference for Georgian and foreign journalists 10 April, are cited by the Tbilisi newspaper VECHERKA. But Gamsakhurdia—then still chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet—finished the famous aphorism as follows: "...and therefore we must be patient a while longer."

Whom is this war against? Eviad Konstantinovich claims: against Georgia and its independence. The main culprit, of course, is the center, from which, according to the republic leader, "Provocation is to be expected, and direct intervention cannot be ruled out." The same theme is being developed on the same emotional wavelength by the republic mass media, which has joined the campaign to discredit the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops and their mission in South Ossetia.

Apocalyptic pictures full of the most improbable fabrications follow one after the other in the local papers. But the real development of the events of recent days indicates: Without the painstaking spadework of the operational-investigative group which has come to the autonomous republic, without the soldiers and officers of the Internal Troops who are fired on from both "camps," the blockade of Tskhinvali would be still going on today. And the guerrillas—both the Georgians and Ossetians—would still be sowing death and destruction.

Another thing is also becoming obvious. The war referred to dramatically before the journalists' corps is being waged against... common sense, and the interests of the republic itself. On 11 April at 1600 hours a long-distance train was stopped as a result of a strike by Georgian railway workers. Veselaya Station, whose very name ["Jolly"] in the aforementioned situation seems like a pearl of black humor, was turned into a key, locking the entrance and exit doors to and from the republic from the Black Sea direction. The next locked

door was at Beyuk-Kyasik on the border with Azerbaijan. The USSR Ministry of Railways took the decision not to load trains bound for Georgia, to not increase the density of the "clots" of trains that have built up at the stations.

According to local press reports, there are 200 railcars stuck at the seaside port of Poti. The number of empty tank cars, flatcars, and refrigerator cars on the tracks leading to the ports in Batumi and Sukhumi is growing. Loads bound for the USSR delivered by foreign vessels are piling up ominously. The latest news: Trucks with loads for Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan have been blockaded in the Zestaforni region. Wasting no words, they are taking the driver's licenses and other documents away from them. The loads, incidentally, are coming from Russia, Belorussia, and the Ukraine....

The thousands of passengers who have become hostage to the strike have already been described. The side effects, which are destroying not only the Georgian economy, but the Armenian economy, too, are discussed more rarely. The leadership of the neighboring republic is showing increasing alarm over the growing scale of the transport blockade, in spite of the "soothing" apology tendered by Z. Gamsakhurdia to L. Ter-Petrosyan. Industrial goods, food products, fuel, and so forth have stopped arriving in Armenia via Georgia. In view of this, the discontentment of the republic's population is understandable, seeing that Armenia is also cut off from deliveries from the direction of neighboring Azerbaijan.

Once again there is an axiom to hand, bitter in its simplicity: We are all linked by one economic umbilical cord; wherever you cut it, all suffer. But perhaps Georgians will help its neighbors out foodwise? Especially seeing that in a recent interview, T. Sigua, chairman of the republic government, painted a highly optimistic picture of the prosperity (perhaps minimal, but at least gastronomic) which is to come to Georgia after 20 April. In the last ten days of the month foodstuffs—meat and butter—are expected to arrive from the FRG and Kenya. Moreover, Kenya has committed itself, according to the contract, to deliver 33,000 tonnes of meat and 22,500 tonnes of butter. Talks are under way about food purchases from Belgium.

I do not know about the rosy future, but the present is so far painted in more prosaic colors. "It should be admitted that for the time being we are in extremely difficult conditions insofar as we are a heavily subsidized republic regarding basic provisions such as foodstuffs and animal feed..." T. Sigua stresses in his interview. "Every year we import 1.8 million tonnes into the republic. In addition, we buy 260,000 tonnes of sugar... 80,000 tonnes of butter, and also other products outside the republic."

I will add to the premier's words: Car owners are already waiting in line from dawn onwards for gasoline, stocks of which are dwindling catastrophically; it is the same story with food products.

What about hopes that deliveries will come from "over the hills?" But, excuse me, how? After all, a whole "armada" of products still has to get through. Perhaps these will come on a flying carpet, for, judging by the words of Z. Gamsakhurdia, there is the prospect of an extension of the transport strike "range." "Perhaps the airports will stop, too," he informed journalists.

It is difficult to understand the logic of a blockade of one's own self, so to speak, even if you hold the center, the Ossetian guerrillas, and the USSR MVD subunits responsible for all mortal sins. And A. Gamsakhurdia's reliance on the Union economy's being seriously undermined by means of this same blockade can hardly be called constructive. That is one side of the coin. Of the other Eviad Konstantinovich said in an address to journalists: "All our hopes are on the West—only democracy is capable of defending us." Well, may God so grant! Maybe in passing, the West will defend also the rights of the passengers stranded in the trains?

On Sunday, 14 April, Z. Gamsakhurdia was elected president of the republic by an extraordinary session of parliament in an open vote (you do not come across that very often!) According to law he is invested with extensive powers. They include—the power to form a government, appoint prefects, adopt decisions on holding referendums, the right to dissolve parliament after consultation with its chairman and the chairman of the government, the right to confer or withdraw citizenship. The president is invested with the functions of commander in chief.

A la guerre, comme a la guerre?

Biography of Georgian Supreme Soviet Chairman

LD1804194391 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 18 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi April 18 TASS—Akakiy Asatiani, 37, elected chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet today, is the youngest head of the Supreme Soviet ever elected to this post in this Transcaucasian republic.

Asatiani is a philologist and chairman of the Union of Georgian Traditionalists, who support constitutional monarchy in the republic.

Asatiani is a close ally of Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia. As representative of the parliament he made an unofficial visit to the U.S. early this year, where he met several congressmen. Unlike Gamsakhurdia, he has frequently travelled to Moscow recently to address the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and meet the country's top leadership.

Asatiani is seen by many as a key figure in Georgia's foreign policy actions.

Armenian Presidium on Situation, Appointments

NC2304121191 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Yerevan, 22 Apr (ARMENPRES)—The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium met on 20 April. Before considering the meeting's agenda, Babken Araraktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, briefed the participants on the situation in Getashen subrayon and about the steps being taken by the republic's leadership to stabilize the situation.

Ovannes Nersisyan was confirmed as first deputy chairman of the Armenian Republic Supreme Court. Gevorg Matevosyan was confirmed as deputy chairman of the Supreme Court.

Rafayel Pogosyan was confirmed as deputy procurator general of the republic and as a member of the collegium of the procuracy.

Armenia Ties Nuclear Power Use to Referendum

NC2004122491 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Levon Ter-Petrosyan chaired the morning session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet on 17 April. During the session Yeduard Yegoryan, acting chairman of the Supreme Soviet Standing Commission for the Establishment of Independent Statehood and National Policy Affairs, presented for the third time a draft on Armenian's national and commemorative holidays. [passage omitted] The bill was still not endorsed, and it will be resubmitted after it is given a final shape.

When it was examining the issue of Nairit Scientific-Production Association, the Supreme Soviet voted 157 in favor, six against, with nine abstentions, to adopt a resolution stipulating that decisions concerning the commissioning of the Armenian Nuclear Power Plant or the construction of a new nuclear power plant must be made by republican referendum. [passage omitted].

Armenian Commission Reviews Land Privatization

NC2204115391 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 21 Apr 91

[Text] The State Central Commission for Land Reform and Privatization held a meeting at the Armenian Republic Council of Ministers. It was chaired by Vazgen Manukyan, chairman of the Council of Ministers.

The results of the activities of the state commission and the work done by its Presidium over the last five months were summarized. Grant Bagratyan, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Economy, delivered a report.

Over this period, the republic's Supreme Soviet and the government adopted more than 40 sublegislative acts. So far, 311 out of the 845 agricultural enterprises [intesutyun] marked for privatization have been allocated to the farmers. The transfer of 474 agricultural enterprises to the farmers is in progress. The work in this direction has not yet started in 60 agricultural enterprises. Eight hundred and ninety-two tractors and 91 combines have been privatized. The process is moving faster in Araratskiy and Stepanavanskiy Rayons.

Misappropriations, favoritism, and illegalities have been uncovered in the work of the local commissions and village councils in some regions. The meeting raised the issue of enlisting the law enforcement bodies in this work and severely punishing those acting outside the law. These local commissions and village councils will not be allowed to make decisions without the knowledge of the State Central Commission for Land Reform and Privatization.

Vazgen Manukyan pointed out a series of important and urgent problems emerging during the implementation of the land reform. If these problems are not solved, it will be impossible to make more progress. The prime minister specifically pointed to the lurking danger, in view of the fact that private and state sectors are operating on an equal basis in this economic field.

The issue of speeding up the privatization of shops, with the possible exception of some foodstuff shops, and completing it by the end of the year, was raised. It was deemed necessary to create the conditions for the emergence of special intermediary firms that would have their own storehouses and communications, would store the agricultural goods on a contractual basis, and would transport them to the shops.

Gagik Arutyunyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet; Mikayel Grigoryan, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers; the republic's ministers, and other officials also took part in the meeting.

More Attacks Reported in Nagorno-Karabakh

Militia Officers, Serviceman Die

NC2004123091 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0600 GMT 20 Apr 91

[From the review of HAYASTANI HANRAPETUTYUN]

[Text] According to reports from Nagorno-Karabakh, (?more than 10) unidentified people attacked a sheep farm in the (?Taluk) Armenian village in Mardakertskiy Rayon on (?18) April. The brigands managed to drive away 300 animals. Kamo Sargisyan, a 54-year resident of the village, was shot in the chest.

On the same day, a VAZ-452 car was shot at near the Azerbaijani village of (?Divanlar) in Fizulinskiy Rayon (?adjacent) to Martuninskiy Rayon. The car was taking a servicemen and militia detail to another location. Militia Lieutenant (?Bundatov), militia Sergeant Agayev, and one

servicemen were killed by unidentified attackers. Militia Sgt. Ismailov, and a serviceman in the car were wounded.

On April 19-20 the now customary exchange of fire took place between Martuni and the Azerbaijani village of (?Khodzhabent).

Internal Troops Attacked

LD2204202191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] In Nagorno Karabakh attacks continue on servicemen of the internal troops of the USSR MVD [Interior Ministry] carrying out their tasks set by the supreme bodies of state power of the USSR for ensuring the security of citizens and maintaining public order. In the evening of 18 April by the population center of Divanallar, Fizuli Rayon, a gang of bandits opened automatic fire on an ambulance carrying officials of Fizuli Rayon Internal Affairs Department and servicemen of the internal troops. As a result of the terrorist act three persons were killed. On 19 April by the population center of Martunashen, Armenian militants attacked a detail of internal troops. Five servicemen were seriously wounded, two of them are in critical condition. The criminals opened automatic and mortar fire. The extremely dangerous crime situaiton which has taken shape around the internal troops forced Colonel General Shatalin, the command of the Internal Troops of the USSR MVD, to write to Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia. The commander of the internal troops expressed confidence that the leadership of Armenia and people's deputies would make due assessment of the incident and the law enforcement bodies would take the appropriate measures both vis-a-vis the direct perpetrators of the crimes and their organizers and ideological inspirers.

Tension 'Not Abating'

NC2304105291 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Text] Tension is not abating in Nagorno-Karabakh. According to reports from Gatrutskiy Rayon, a former combine driver, 60-year Suren Mesropyan, was killed there.

The armed brigand groups operating in the same region drove away nearly 500 farm animals from the Armenian village of Drakhtik. The attackers also took two Armenians hostage but released them later.

Two Azerbaijanis were killed in Shaumyanovskiy Rayon. The Karintak village in Shushinskiy Rayon came under fire and one house was burned. This time around there were no casualties. According to preliminary information, the villagers were able to defend themselves against the attackers.

Azerbaijani television broadcasts have again begun to foment anti-Armenian sentiments. All the blame for the destabilization of the situation along the borders of the two republics and in Nagorno-Karabakh is placed on Armenia and on the so-called Armenian raiders. Whereas, the Azerbaijani mass media prefers to keep silent when it comes to the criminal acts of the Azerbaijani special formations, after whose appearance on the scene the interethnic situation became particularly acute.

The neighboring republic and the center have so far stubbornly refused to understand a plain truth: The Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh, just like any other self-respecting people, will never consent to the degradation of its national and human dignity.

Central Asia

Kyrgyz Supreme Soviet Rejects Union Treaty

PM2204205591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Apr 91 p 4

[Report by M. Ozmitel: "Kyrgyzstan: Legislative Rejection"]

[Text] The unexpected happened at a session of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan Supreme Soviet—the legislature, which had been prepared to unconditionally sign the draft Union treaty, has renounced its intentions. The reasons for the renunciation were set out in the speech by A. Akayev, president of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, in which he bitterly criticized virtually all the points of the treaty.

Dissatisfaction was expressed with the ban on barter deals—as speakers at the session see it, it is essentially antimarket. Any treaty presupposes an agreement on mutual obligations. However, according to the treaty, only the republics have obligations, while the center invests itself with all the powers.

Topics connected with the signing of the Union treaty cannot be understood without taking the constantly changing situation into account. The Republic of Kyrgyzstan has already signed treaties of friendship and cooperation with Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. In the very near future, a treaty will be signed with Belorussia and one may also be signed with Turkmenia. There is also a draft treaty with Russia.

Kyrgyz President Presents Anti-Crisis Program

LD2204103891 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Boris Mainayev]

[Text] Bishkek April 22 TASS—"Kyrgyzstan is on the brink of a social and food crisis," the republic's president Askar Akayev told the fourth session of the Kyrgyzstan parliament, which ended here today after seven days of keen deliberations. "The situation can be rectified only by a programme of anti-crisis measures," Akayev stressed.

The president believes it is necessary first of all to immediately launch a land reform, allowing the peasantry to make more efficient use of the land at its disposal. "Diversity of forms of farming—cooperatives, state and collective farms, leased husbandries—is able to stop the present downslide to hunger," he said.

Akayev moves to leave the state order at the level of 1990 and allow the husbandries to sell the remaining 20 per cent of their production at contractual and free prices. He advocates the launching of joint industrial and agricultural ventures, allowing to make extensive use of natural exchanges without the participation of the rouble. "To enhance discipline in the delivery of production and fulfilment of concluded contracts," Agayev believes, "It is necessary to resort to a mechanism of legal and criminal responsibility."

"The republic has no means at its disposal," the president said. "If we do not find them, we will have no money to pay wages this May. This is why we recommend our banks to draw up a list of enterprises heading towards bankruptcy and to start their privatisation. In order to save our economy, we intend to seek credits in Russia and the Ukraine."

The fourth session of the Supreme Soviet of Kyrgyzstan, a Soviet Central Asian republic, has approved a land code and a land legislation, as well as a resolution to implement the USSR pensions law, the invalids social protection law and several other bills. The Supreme Soviet approved the draft federal treaty, drawn up by a commission of the Kyrgyzstan Parliament.

Kyrgyz Party Work Viewed; Girenko Visits

PM1704115191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev report: "Closer to People"]

[Text] Bishkek, 11 Apr—The renewal of cadres, the choice of priority objectives, and the acquisition of new work methods are all typical of the republic party organization of Kyrgyzstan today. Our newspaper has already reported on the republic Communist Party Central Committee's two-day plenum. A. Masaliyev has been released from his duties as first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee on his transfer to work in the CPSU Central Committee apparatus. Dzh. Amanbayev has been elected to this post. Young party workers T. Aytbayaev, V. Artemov, and A. Sulaymankulov, who had performed well in the oblasts and rayons, have become new Central Committee secretaries.

Four new party obkoms [oblast party committee]—Chuy, Dzhalab-Abad, Naryn, and Talas—have become actively involved in work. The rapprochment of party committees and primary party organizations and the attention paid to the specific work and concerns of labor collectives are helping stabilize the situation in the republic and increase the efficiency of its economy. This is already having an effect in the increased pace of spring sowing and in overcoming crisis phenomena in light industry.

The republic is currently playing host to CPSU Central Committee Secretary A. Girenko. He has been to a number of industrial enterprises and met with labor collectives, workers of management bodies, and young people.

Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan Sign Treaty

LD2204181891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Ashkhabad, 22 Apr (TURKMENINFORM-TASS)—A visit to Turkmeninstan by an Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic state delegation led by Islam Karimov, president of the republic, has ended with the signing of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the two neighboring republics. An intergovernmental agreement on economic and cultural cooperation for the years 1992-1995 was also concluded. [passage omitted]

Asian Republic Leaders To Attend Council Meeting

AU2304110091 Paris AFP in English 1004 GMT 23 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 23 (AFP)—Several Central Asian republican leaders on Tuesday left the Soviet parliament for talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev on economic cooperation.

Ukrainian Premier Vitold Fokin, one of those also going, said that a working meeting of republican leaders was to take place to discuss Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's "anti-crisis" economic proposals. The government's proposals, put to parliament Monday, "suffered from a number of shortcomings", Mr. Fokin said.

"The talks will be very difficult. I think it might be impossible to find a consensus," he said. "We should adopt general principles and let each republic work out its own programme," Mr. Fokin added.

Mr. Gorbachev had originally announced a meeting of the Federation Council for Tuesday to examine the draft union treaty.

But with at least six republics boycotting the council's work, officials appeared reluctant to describe this as a full-scale meeting of the council, the country's top executive body.

Those preparing to leave parliament for the meeting included Azerbaijan's President Ayaz Mutalibov, Turkmenistan's Sapamurad Niyazov, Kazakhstan's Nursultan Nazarbayev, Tajikistan's Kakhar Makhkamov and Kyrgyzia's Askar Akayev.